DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 811 IR 007 078

AUTHOR Perritt, Lea J., Ed.; Mertens, Donna M., Ed.
TITLE Summative Evaluation of Workshops: Spring, 1978.
INSTITUTION Appalachian Education Satellite Project, Lexington, Ky.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 78
NOTE 136p.; For related documents, see IR 006 650 and 007 077

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Art Appreciation; *Communication Satellites; Copyrights; Educational Finance; *Educational Technology; Energy Conservation; Evaluation; Health Services; *Inservice Education; Older Adults; Self Concept; *Seminars; *Telecommunication; Values; *Workshops

ABSTRACT

The ten workshops described were delivered by the Appalachian Education Satellite Program (AESP), which was established in 1971 to determine the feasibility of satellite delivery of graduate and undergraduate courses to educators in the Appalachian region. AESP programming was expanded in 1977 to include workshops for such audiences as human resource, medical and health, business and industrial, and government personnel, as well as educators; topics covered in the spring 1978 workshops included the arts and aging, resource conservation for educational institutions, the University of Cincinnati external degree program in health planning/administration, developing a positive self-concept, an AESP advisory board teleconference, teacher values and discipline, and copyright law. Evaluation instruments were completed by both participants and site monitors following each workshop in order to evaluate student satisfaction, achievement of the objectives defined for each program, the technical quality of the broadcast, and interest in future AESP programming. (Author/RAO)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED165811

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SUMMATIVE EVALUATION OF WORKSHOPS

SPRING, 1978

Edited by

Lea J. Perritt

and

Donna M. Mertens

November, 1978

IR007078

The Technical Report Series of the Appalachian Education Satellite Program is edited and published by the RCC Evaluation Component at the University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

The purpose of this series is to document and disseminate information about the design, implementation and results of the AESP experiment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

AESP-ARC Personnel

Harold Morse, Director of AESP
Dennis Goldstein, Associate Director of AESP
Robert Shuman, Deputy Director of AESP
James Freeman, Chief Engineer
Jerry Goerz, Engineer
Dave Buckingham, Regional Site Coordinator
Mike Boyle, Regional Site Coordinator

AESP-RCC Personnel

Nofflet Williams, Director of RCC
Cathy Hensley, Coordinator of Field Services
Donna Mertens, Coordinator of Evaluation
Lea Perritt, Evaluator
Danlo Kao, Data Analyst
Deborah Daugherty, Research Associate
Deborah Danner, Research Associate
Tod Porter, Media Development Specialist
Katheryn Ranta, Curriculum Development Specialist
Diane Van Hoven, Information Specialist
Melanie Barber, Clerical Assistant
Jen Jen Hsieh, Clerical Assistant
Rosemary Waters, Senior Administrative Assistant
Debby Kahoe, Clerical Assistant
Shirley Gingerich, Clerical Assistant
Karen Berry, Field Services Secretary
Marianne Truong, Evaluation Secretary
Roger Koonce, Associate Director for Instructional Design and Production
Rick Falknor, Assistant Media Services Coordinator
Britt Davis, Producer-Director
Paul LeVeque, Producer-Director
Jerry McDonald, Producer-Director

AESP Cluster Directors

Jerry Ayers, Tennessee
Alice Beckman, New York and Pennsylvania
Frank Skinnell, Tennessee
John Allen, Alabama
Morley Jones, Virginia and North Carolina
Frank Peto, Maryland, West Virginia and Pennsylvania
Don Smith, Alabama and Georgia
Rick Williamson, West Virginia and Pennsylvania
Kathryn Zachary, North Carolina and Georgia
Wylie Wood, Mississippi
Tom Stack, Ohio
Bill Rosenberg, Kentucky
Joan Mason, South Carolina

TECHNICAL REPORT SERIES

1. AESP Data Base Information: Rationale, Data Collection Procedure, Interpretation of Results. Prepared by William J. Bramble, Claudine Ausness, Larry Harding and Robert Wetter. Winter 1973.

2. An Experiment in Educational Technology: An Overview of the Appalachian Education Satellite Project. Prepared by Claudine Ausness and Betty Bowling. March, 1974.

3. Formative Evaluation Study for AESP Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Courses. Prepared by William J. Bramble, Claudine Ausness and Robert Wetter. October, 1974.

4. The Evaluation Design: Summer Courses, 1974. Prepared by William J. Bramble, Claudine Ausness, Robert Wetter and Larry Harding. December, 1974.

5. Performance of AESP Transmission/Reception Equipment (Summer and Fall, 1974). Prepared by William J. Bramble, Claudine Ausness and James R. Freeman. July, 1975.

6. Student Ratings of Instructional Activities: Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Instruction, Summer, 1974. Prepared by Rodger Marion, William J. Bramble, Robert Wetter and Cathy Whitton, July, 1975.

7. Student Ratings of Instructional Activites: Career Education in the Elementary Grades, Summer, 1974. Prepared by Larry Harding, William J. Bramble and Rodger Marion. August, 1975.

8. Student Achievement: Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Instruction Course, Summer, 1974. Prepared by Rodger Marion, William J. Bramble and Claudine Ausness. August, 1975.

9. Student Achievement: Career Education in the Elementary Grades, Summer, 1974. Prepared by Rodger Marion, William J. Bramble and Claudine Ausness. August, 1975.

10. Cost Estimation Model for Alternative Course Formats and Delivery Modes. Prepared by William J. Bramble, Claudine Ausness, and Donna Mertens. September, 1975.

11. Summative Evaluation of Career Education in the Secondary School Course, Fall, 1974. Prepared by Diane Maynard, Rodger Marion and William J. Bramble. September, 1975.

12. Summative Evaluation of Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Instruction K-6 Course, Spring, 1975. Prepared by William J. Bramble, Diane Maynard and Rodger Marion. September, 1975.

TECHNICAL REPORT SERIES

13. Review of the Literature: Appalachian Needs in Five Programming Areas. Prepared by Donna M. Mertens and William J. Bramble, June, 1976.

14. Results of Appalachian Needs Assessment Conferences. Prepared by Donna M. Mertens and William J. Bramble. June, 1976.

15. DPRI and CES Follow-Up Studies. Prepared by Jody L. Fitzpatrick and Donna M. Mertens. July 1977.

16. Development, Delivery and Evaluation of AESP's Visual Learning Course. Prepared by Donna M. Mertens. August, 1977.

17. Summative Evaluation of Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Instruction K-6 Course, Spring, 1977, and Career Education in the Elementary School Course, Summer, 1977. Prepared by Lea J. Perritt and Donna M. Mertens. November, 1977.

18. Summative Evaluation of Workshops, Summer, 1977. Prepared by Lea J. Perritt and Donna M. Mertens. December 1977.

19. A Formative Evaluation of Teaching the Young Handicapped Child. Prepared by Jody L. Fitzpatrick. June, 1978.

20. Summative Evaluation of Workshops, Fall, 1977. Edited by Donna M. Mertens and Lea J. Perritt. June, 1978.

21. Summative Evaluation of Designing Success Strategies, Fall, 1977, and Diagnostic and Prescriptive Reading Instruction K-6 Course, Fall, 1977. Prepared by Lea J. Perritt, Deborah Daugherty and Donna M. Mertens. July, 1978.

22. Summative Evaluation of Simple Gifts, Spring, 1978, and Designing Success Strategies, Spring, 1978. Prepared by Lea J. Perritt, Deborah Danner and Donna M. Mertens. November, 1978.

23. Summative Evaluation of Workshops, Spring, 1978. Edited by Lea J. Perritt and Donna M. Mertens. November, 1978.

24. Summative Evaluation of Teaching the Young Handicapped Child, Spring, 1978. Prepared by Deborah Daugherty and Donna M. Mertens. November, 1978.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
WORKSHOP REPORTS	
Arts and Aging Workshop by Deborah Daugherty and Lea J. Perritt	4
Conservation of Resources by Educational Institutions: "Energy Conservation for Existing Buildings" and "Fiscal Conservation/Budget Development" by Lea J. Perritt	16
University of Cincinnati's External Non-Degree Program in Health Planning/Administration by Deborah Daugherty.	31
Developing a Positive Self-image: "Overview and Working with the Young Child" and "The Adolescent's Self-image and the Adult's Self-image" by Lea J. Perritt	43
AESP Advisory Board Teleconference by Donna M. Mertens	63
Teacher Values: "Problems in Discipline" and "Dealing with Defiance" by Lea J. Perritt	90
The New Copyright Law: Issues and Answers by Deborah Danner	105
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	117

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Schedule of Workshops Delivered During Spring 1978	3
	Arts and Aging Workshop	
2	Frequency of Participants by Site	7
3	Background Characteristics of the Participants	8
4	Site Monitor's Ratings of Equipment Functioning	12
5	Rank Ordering of Topics for Future Programs.	14
	Conservation of Resources by Educational Institutions Workshops	
6	Frequency of Participants by Site	19
7	Background Characteristics of the Participants by Session . .	20
8	Site Monitor's Ratings of Equipment Functioning.	27
9	Rank Ordering of Topics for Future Programs (Session I) . . .	30
10	Rank Ordering of Topics for Future Programs (Session II) . . .	30
	University of Cincinnati's Health Planning/Administration Program	
11	Frequency of Participants by Site	34
12	Background Characteristics of the Participants	35
13	Site Monitor's Ratings of Equipment Functioning.	40
	Self-Concept Workshops	
14	Frequency of Participants by Site and Session	47
15	Background Characteristics of the Participants	48
16	Site Monitor's Ratings of Equipment Functioning	55
17	Rank Ordering of Topics for Future Programs in Human Relations Areas (Session I)	57
18	Rank Ordering of Topics for Future Programs in Human Relations Areas (Session II)	58

LIST OF TABLES -- CONTINUED

Table		Page
19	Rank Ordering of Topics for Future Programs by Human Relations Area (Session I)	59
20	Rank Ordering of Topics for Future Programs by Human Relations Area (Session II)	59
21	Rank Ordering of Topics for Future Programs by Target Age Group (Session I)	60
22	Rank Ordering of Topics for Future Programs by Target Age Group (Session II)	60
	AESP Advisory Board Teleconference	
23	Frequency of Forms Returned by Site	65
24	Frequency of Advisory Board Members by Occupational Areas	66
25	Average Ratings for Workshops by Advisory Board Members	69
26	Average Ratings by Education Members of Advisory Board	70
27	Priority Topics Listed by Education Members of Advisory Council	73
28	Average Ratings by Business and Industry Members of Advisory Board	74
29	Priority Topics Listed by Business and Industry Members	77
30	Average Ratings by Human Resource Members of Advisory Council	78
31	Priority Topics Listed by Human Resource Members	80
32	Average Ratings by Government Members	81
33	Average Ratings by Medical and Health Members	83
34	Priority Topics Listed by Medical and Health Members	86
35	Rank Ordering of Topics for Workshops by Advisory Board Members Overall and by Occupational Area	87
36	Equipment Functioning	88

LIST OF TABLES -- CONTINUED

Table		Page
	Teacher Values Workshops	
37	Frequency of Participants by Site	93
38	Background Characteristics of the Participants	94
39	Site Monitor's Ratings of Equipment Functioning.	101
	The New Copyright Law: Issues and Answers Workshop	
40	Frequency of Participants by Site	108
41	Background Characteristics of the Participants	109
42	Site Monitor's Ratings of Equipment Functioning	113
	Summary	
43	Frequency of Participants by Sites, Spring 1978 Workshops	118

INTRODUCTION

In 1971, the Appalachian Education Satellite Program (AESP) was established. The original purpose of the project was to determine the feasibility of satellite delivery of graduate and undergraduate courses to educators in the Appalachian region. Since that time, AESP has developed and delivered teacher education courses in the areas of career education, reading instruction, classroom management, the use of television in the classroom, and teaching the handicapped child (results of these courses are presented in Technical Reports #6-9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, and 21). Using NASA's ATS-6 satellite, the AESP network is presently capable of broadcasting programs to 45 sites in the 13 state Appalachian area.

In 1977, AESP expanded its programming to include workshops which were designed for educators as well as other audiences including human resource, medical and health, business and industrial, and government personnel. Nine workshops were planned and delivered during the Summer of 1977 and an additional nine were broadcast during the Fall of 1977. Results of these workshops are reported in AESP Technical Reports #18 and 20.

The purpose of this report is to document the AESP's delivery of ten workshops during the Spring of 1978. Workshops were developed on the following topics: arts and aging, resource conservation for educational institutions, the University of Cincinnati external degree program in health planning/administration, developing a positive self-concept, advisory board teleconference, teacher values and discipline, and copyright law.

Evaluation instruments were completed by both participants and site monitors following each workshop in order to evaluate student satisfaction, achievement of the objectives defined for each program, the technical quality of the broadcast, and interest in future AESP programming.

The following sections of this report present the results of the workshops delivered during the Spring 1978. Table 1 presents the titles and delivery dates of these workshops. The results are reported in the following order: arts and aging, conservation of resources by educational institutions, the University of Cincinnati external degree program in health planning/administration, developing a positive self-image, AESP advisory board teleconference, teacher values and discipline, and copyright law.

TABLE 1

SCHEDULE OF WORKSHOPS DELIVERED DURING SPRING 1978

Workshop	Date
Arts and Aging	January 25, 1978
Conservation of Resources by Educational Institutions: Energy Conservation for Existing Buildings	February 2, 1978
University of Cincinnati's External Non-Residential Degree Program in Health Planning/Administration	March 6, 1978
Developing a Positive Self-Image: Overview and Working With the Young Child	March 13, 1978
AESP Advisory Board Teleconference	March 27, 1978
Developing a Positive Self-Image: The Adolescent's Self-Image and the Adult's Self-Image	April 10, 1978
Conservation of Resources by Educational Institutions: Fiscal Conservation/Budget Development	April 13, 1978
Teacher Values: Problems in Discipline	April 17, 1978
Teacher Values: Dealing with Defiance	April 24, 1978
The New Copyright Law: Issues and Answers	May 8, 1978

ARTS AND AGING WORKSHOP

January 25, 1978

Deborah Daugherty and Lea J. Perritt

More than a million Americans retire each year and most face the problems of finding something to do with their time and new ways to channel their interests and abilities. For the majority of these persons physical and mental capabilities are not limiting, nevertheless, some still remain inactive.

Dealing with this problem has become a national priority, and the National Council on the Aging and the National Endowment for the Arts have been exploring various ways of involving the older person in creative arts programs. Many people feel that if any real impact is to be made, leaders in the arts as well as aging will need to be convinced that the older person should be encouraged to participate in all art forms.

In order to address this need, the Appalachian Education Satellite Program (AESP), in conjunction with the National Council on the Aging, the National Center on Arts and Aging, and the University of Kentucky College of Fine Arts, developed and delivered a workshop for professionals in the fields of aging and the arts, as well as for the older person. The workshop was designed to promote an awareness of the importance of arts programs for the older person, the mechanics of developing such programs, and examples of programs currently underway.

Format of the Workshops

The workshop included a presentation of film segments, a live, interactive seminar, and distribution of related printed materials. The program began with excerpts from the film series "Getting On" which was produced by the Getting On Television Project, New York City Department for the Aging. These film segments related the stories of two older persons who became actively

involved in creative arts careers late in life, and described their attitudes and feelings about their work and their lives.

Following the film, panel members discussed some of the issues and concerns related to the provision of arts programs for the older person. Participants were then given an opportunity to direct questions to panel members located in the television studios in Lexington, Kentucky. The panelists consisted of the following persons:

Mr. Jack Ossossky, Executive Director of the National Council on the Aging

Dr. Ruth Glick, Director of the Institute for Retirement Studies, Case Western Reserve University

Dr. Donald Hoffman, Associate Professor of Art Education, University of Kentucky

The panel was moderated by Dr. Robert J. Willis, Dean of the College of Fine Arts, University of Kentucky.

During the interactive seminar, participants transmitted questions via telephone and teletype to the University of Kentucky television studios.

Each participant also received printed material designed to supplement the material presented in the television program.

At the conclusion of the seminar, participants completed a brief evaluation form to determine their reaction to the program. The evaluation form provided information concerning the background characteristics of viewers, their reactions to the film segments and interactive seminar, and their perception of the technical quality of the presentation. The participants also responded to several questions designed to measure the attainment of specific cognitive and affective objectives and to several questions designed to ascertain their interest in future programs. This information forms the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Viewers

A total of 285 persons at 19 AESP sites participated in the workshop.

Evaluation instruments were received from 186 participants (65% of those attending). The frequency of participants by sites is presented in Table 2. Table 3 presents the background characteristics of the participants who completed the evaluation forms.

The majority of the participants were females and were employed in rural communities. The ages of the participants spanned a broad range from less than 25 years old to over 65. The largest number of participants were employed in senior citizens centers as program or activities directors.

Reaction to the Film Segments

The participants were asked to rate the the film segments, described earlier in this report, according to their value as a source of practical information, as a source of stimulation for discussion, and for their overall value. They used the following scale to indicate their responses: 1 - excellent, 2 - very good, 3 - good, 4 - fair, 5 - poor. As a source of practical information and stimulation for discussion, the audience rated the film segments as very good (average ratings = 2.15 and 2.28, respectively). The participants' overall rating of the film segments was also very good (average rating = 2.33).

The participants criticized the film segments because they portrayed a selected group of older persons who were not representative of the majority of the older persons. The following comments indicate that the program was worthwhile but that a more balanced presentation would have been desirable.

"Would have liked more 'grass roots' information such as specific examples, experiences, trials, errors."

"Should deal with people who have no education."

"Need specific arts ideas for low-skilled people."

"Very worthwhile."

"Very interesting and stimulating."

"The women shown were too exceptional."

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE
ARTS AND AGING WORKSHOP

AESP Sites		Number registered	Number returning evaluation forms
06	Greenville, SC	14	10
08	Scooba, MS	16	9
09	Tupelo, MS	23	19
10	Huntsville, AL	2	1
*13	Gadsden, AL	(12)	(10)
14	Rome, GA	2	2
18	Cookeville, TN	5	4
19	McMinnville, TN	5	5
25	Cumberland, MD	27	6
30	Hagerstown, MD	3	1
31	Bethany, WV	4	4
35	Fredonia, NY	12	9
37	Edinboro, PA	43	33
38	Smethport, PA	32	26
40	Sylva, NC	41	37
42	Marion, NC	16	1
43	Asheville, NC	7	7
45	Gainesville, GA	15	6
55	Somerset, KY	6	6
Total		273 (285)	186 (196)

*These instruments were received after data were analyzed and therefore are not included in this report.

TABLE 3

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS
ARTS AND AGING WORKSHOP

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Female	163	88%
Male	19	10%
No response	4	2%
Age		
Under 25	31	17%
25 - 29	24	13%
30 - 39	29	16%
40 - 49	22	12%
50 - 59	30	16%
60 - 64	18	10%
65 or over	28	15%
No response	4	2%
Community in which they work		
Rural	106	57%
Urban	53	28%
Suburban	16	9%
No response	11	6%
Organization affiliated with*		
Senior citizens center	52	28%
Aging agency	38	20%
Nursing home	36	19%
Arts and recreation programs	21	11%
Health-related programs	21	11%
Senior volunteers programs	6	3%
Adult and continuing education programs	7	4%
Retired	3	2%
Other	17	9%
No response	12	6%
Occupation		
Senior citizens program director	36	19%
Activities director	25	13%
Social worker or counselor	22	12%
Community aid	11	6%
Artist or art instructor	12	6%
Nurse	5	3%
Student	11	6%
Retired	10	5%
Unemployed	16	9%
Other	22	12%
No response	16	9%

* Includes multiple responses.

Reaction to the Interactive Seminar

The participants were asked to react to the seminar moderator and panelists, and to the answers they received during the seminar. They were also asked to provide their overall evaluation of the seminar. The majority of the respondents (65%) felt the seminar moderator was fine. The most frequent recommendations for improvement were to keep the seminar moving at a faster pace so that more questions could be answered and to ask guests to give more detailed answers.

The majority of the respondents (57%) felt the panel members were fine. The most frequent recommendations for improvement were more diversity of viewpoints and more discussion among the panelists.

The respondents were less positive about the answers they received to their questions. Only 38 percent were satisfied with the answers they received. The most frequent suggestion was more use of specific examples.

The overall rating of the seminar was between "good" and "very good" (average rating = 2.33).

The following representative comments support these ratings:

"The seminar was very good, but would have been more effective if more extensive studies on how to meet some of the problems were given."

"Theory is good - but examples needed."

Attainment of Objectives

The workshop was designed around several specific objectives which the participants were expected to achieve as a result of participating in the program. These objectives were:

1. Demonstrate an awareness of arts programs as important leisure activities for older persons;
2. Display an interest in providing creative art services to older persons;
3. Identify techniques used to develop joint programs on the arts and aging.

The first objective, to demonstrate an awareness of arts programs as important leisure activities for older persons, was measured with three

items. Participants were asked to respond to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this workshop, I now have a greater awareness of the importance of creative arts for older persons." Eighty-six percent moderately or strongly agreed with this item. This average rating was 1.75 which is "moderately agree". Participants also responded to two true-false items. Eighty-six percent knew that most older persons can function at a high level with little loss of intellectual ability. However, only 29 percent knew that arts programming for the older person requires consideration of different factors than programs for younger persons do. This may be due to the ambiguity of the statement. Arts programming for the elderly requires consideration of the same factors as well as additional factors.

The second objective, to display an interest in providing creative art services to older persons, was measured by asking participants whether they planned to try to implement a program to provide arts' experiences for older persons. Seventy-seven percent agreed or moderately agreed with this item. No participant disagreed with this item.

The third objective, to identify techniques used to develop joint programs on the arts and aging, was measured with three items. Eighty-three percent of the participants strongly or moderately agreed that they now had a better understanding of joint programs on the arts and aging. Seventy-five percent of the participants were able to identify at least one problem that might be encountered when attempting to implement arts programming for the elderly, 63 percent were able to identify at least two problems, and 59 percent correctly identified all three problems listed. Ninety-three percent of the participants were able to identify at least one technique used to develop joint arts and aging programs, 56 percent identified at least two techniques, and 52 percent were able to identify all three techniques.

Technical Aspects

AESP site monitors rated the technical functioning of the equipment used in the program, and participants rated the quality of the reception of the audio and video signals during the program. The site monitors' ratings of the equipment functioning are presented in Table 4. The ATS-6 system operated effectively at 18 of the sites. One malfunction occurred at Gainesville, GA. They were unable to receive either the audio or video portion of the broadcast, but rescheduled the program for a later date. No reason was given for this malfunction. Although no other sites reported malfunctions which interrupted the broadcast, video distortion was reported at Gadsden, AL; Rome, GA; Marion, NC; and Scooba, MS.

Overall, the site monitors rated the video reception as having between barely perceptible and definitely perceptible distortion. They rated the objectionableness of the distortion as "slightly annoying." The average rating of the clarity of the picture by participants was between "very good" and "good" (average rating = 2.58).

The site monitors rated the quality of the sound as readable with "practically no" or "no" difficulty and the signal strength as "good" to "very good". The participants rated the quality of the sound between "good" and "very good" (average rating = 2.34).

Needs Assessment

AESP is interested in offering more programs on topics related to the aging. Therefore, participants were asked to respond to several topics related to aging in terms of their interest in attending programs on these topics. They rated each topic using a scale 1 to 5 where 1 = great interest and 5 = no interest. The results of these ratings are presented in Table 5.

The fact that 8 of the 9 topics were rated highly indicated a strong

TABLE 4

SITE MONITOR'S RATINGS OF EQUIPMENT FUNCTIONING
ARTS AND AGING WORKSHOP

Site		Audio	Video
06	Greenville, SC	3 x 3	4 x 4
08	Scooba, MS	3 x 3	2 x 3
09	Tupelo, MS	3 x 3	4 x 4
10	Huntsville, AL	3 x 3	4 x 4
13	Gadsden, AL	2 x 2	3 x 3
14	Rome, GA	2 x 2	2 x 2
18	Cookeville, TN	3 x 3	4 x 5
19	McMinnville, TN	3 x 3	4 x 4
25	Cumberland, MD	3 x 3	4 x 5
30	Hagerstown, MD	report not received	report not received
31	Bethany, WV	report not received	report not received
35	Fredonia, NY	3 x 3	4 x 4
37	Edinboro, NY	incomplete report	incomplete report
38	Smethport, PA	incomplete report	incomplete report
40	Sylva, NC	3 x 3	4 x 4
42	Marion, NC	3 x 3	4 x 4
43	Ashville, NC	report not received	report not received
45	Gainesville, GA	no go	no go
55	Somerset, KY	3 x 3	5 x 5

See code for audio and video rating on the following page.

Video Signal Rating Scale

Distortion and/or Noise Perceptibility

1. Picture content impossible to ascertain
2. Very perceptible distortion and/or noise but picture content ascertainable
3. Definitely perceptible distortion and/or noise
4. Barely perceptible distortion and/or noise
5. Imperceptible

Distortion and/or Noise Objectionableness

1. Extremely annoying
2. Very annoying
3. Definitely annoying
4. Slightly annoying
5. Not annoying

Audio Signal Rating Scale

Readability

1. Unreadable
2. Readable with difficulty
3. Readable with practically no difficulty or no difficulty

Signal Strength

1. Faint signals or very weak signals
2. Fair signals
3. Good signals or very good signals

TABLE 5

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS IN AGING ARTS AND AGING WORKSHOP

Topic	Mean
Developing senior citizen programs	1.68
Recreational activities	1.68
Leisure time activities	1.72
Psychology of aging	1.84
Basic gerontology	2.19
Retirement preparation	2.20
Health resources	2.21
Home care maintenance	2.36
Drug education	2.79

1 = great interest
5 = no interest

interest generally in the area of aging. The strongest interest was expressed in programs concerning developing senior citizen programs, recreational activities, leisure time activities and the psychology of aging.

Ninety percent of the participants indicated that they would be interested in attending additional workshops on aging topics and 78 percent indicated interest in a course on aging. The most frequently preferred types of credit were graduate college credit (35%) and certificate of attendance (28%). Eighty-seven percent of the respondents indicated they would be willing to pay a small fee for participating in a workshop or a course.

Conclusions

Two hundred and eighty-five persons at 19 AESP sites participated in a workshop on the arts and the aging. The participants reacted to film segments and an interactive seminar, several cognitive and attitudinal questions, the technical quality of the broadcast, and topics for future programs.

The film segments were rated as "very good." The major criticism was that a rather select group of the elderly was presented in the film segments.

The seminar was rated between "good" and "very good." The most frequent suggestions for improvement were to use examples more frequently and more diversity of viewpoints among the panelists. The objectives for this workshop were met by the majority of the participants.

Technical difficulties interrupted the broadcast at one of the sites.

The needs assessment information indicated a strong interest in the area of aging. The strongest interest was expressed in programs concerning senior citizens programs, recreational activities, leisure time activities, and the psychology of the aging.

CONSERVATION OF RESOURCES BY EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS: "ENERGY CONSERVATION FOR EXISTING BUILDINGS" AND "FISCAL CONSERVATION/BUDGET DEVELOPMENT"

February 2 and April 13, 1978

Lea J. Perritt

Introduction

Tight budgets, increasing costs for services, and the need to conserve energy have created problems for educational institutions at all levels. In order to increase efficiency, avoid duplication, and share resources, affirmative programs must be implemented by these institutions. Many administrators at the policy making level as well as the key persons responsible for implementing the policies have received little guidance in identifying and implementing appropriate conservation measures.

In order to provide these persons with more specific guidance in resource conservation methods, the Appalachian Education Satellite Program (AESP), in conjunction with the Regional Education Services Agency of Maryland and The Center for Management Development at Frostburg State College in Frostburg, Maryland, developed and delivered a series of four seminars. Each seminar dealt with a different conservation issue of concern to educational institutions and was designed to provide a solid scientific base for that issue. The topics of these four seminars were:

Seminar 1 - Energy Conservation for Existing Buildings
Seminar 2 - Fiscal Conservation/Budget Development
Seminar 3 - Fiscal Conservation/Purchase of Services and Materials
Seminar 4 - School Operations/Dealing with Declining Enrollments.

This report documents the results of the first two seminars in the series.

Format of the Seminars

The first seminar began with a short videotaped introductory address by Senator Claiborne Peel of Rhode Island. Senator Peel, who is a sponsor

of energy conservation legislation in Congress, presented an overview of the problem and the pertinent legislation. Next William Pollard, the program moderator, outlined the problem, identified types of solutions, suggested an approach to categorizing and implementing solutions, and introduced the panelists.

Each panelist presented solutions in terms of their experience in public schools, institutions of higher learning, legislative directors, and the outlook for the future.

Following the panel presentations, participants were given an opportunity to direct questions via teletype or telephone to the panel members located in the television studios in Lexington, Kentucky.

The panel consisted of the following persons:

William Haessig, Director of Educational Facility Planning, New York State Education Department

Dallas Sullivan, Director of Energy Conservation of Physical Facilities, Ohio State University

Faith Lambert, Office of State and Local Programs for Conservation and Solar Applications, U.S. Department of Energy

Yale Stenzler, Education Consultant, Maryland State Department of Education

Following the question and answer portion of the program, Mr. Pollard provided a summary of the important points brought out during the seminar.

The second session began with a short introduction of panelists and an overview of the problem by Mr. Pollard who was moderator for this session also. This was followed by a panel discussion of existing and possible budgeting procedures for educational institutions, with particular emphasis on the benefits and mechanics of zero-base budgeting.

A 30-minute two-channel audio transmission followed which allowed the audience to participate in a step-by-step solution to a budget

problem and to transmit questions to the panelists.

The final 45 minutes of the program consisted of a question and answer period, further discussion among the panel members, and a short summary by Mr. Pollard.

The panel consisted of the following persons:

Donald Alexander, Dean of Academic Affairs at Allegany County Community College in Maryland

David Winfield, Economic Consultant, Croftan, Maryland.

Follow-up workshops were conducted at some sites after each seminar for the purpose of dealing in greater detail with conservation issues which are unique to specific regions. These workshops allowed the participants the opportunity to evaluate what they had learned at the seminar and also to designate other personnel to attend these follow-up sessions.

At the end of each seminar, participants completed a brief evaluation form to determine their reaction to the program. This information forms the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Viewers

The analysis of participant reaction was conducted separately for the two sessions. A total of 182 persons at 15 AESP sites attended the first session and 47 persons at 12 sites attended the second session. Evaluation forms were received from 128 participants (70 percent of those attending) at the first session and 42 (89 percent of those attending) at the second session. The frequency of participants by site for each session is presented in Table 6. Table 7 presents the background characteristics of the participants who completed the evaluation forms.

The majority of the participants at both sessions were males and were employed in rural communities. The most frequent reason given for

TABLE 6

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE
RESOURCE CONSERVATION SEMINARS

Site		Session I		Session II	
		Number registered	Number completing forms	Number registered	Number completing forms
06	Greenville, SC	30	26	8	5
09	Tupelo, MS	2	2	1	0
10	Huntsville, AL	5	4	6	6
12	Guntersville, AL	-	-	1	0
14	Rome, GA	1	1	1	1
18	Cookeville, TN	29	19	7	7
25	Cumberland, MD	64	39	10	10
29	Altoona, PA	1	1	-	-
31	Bethany, WV	2	2	3	3
35	Fredonia, NY	13	8	6	6
36	Olean, NY	1	1	-	-
37	Edinboro, PA	14	8	-	-
38	Smethport, PA	4	4	2	2
40	Sylva, NC	11	11	1	1
45	Gainesville, GA	1	1	-	-
55	Somerset, KY	4	1	1	1
Total		182	128	47	42

TABLE 7

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS BY SESSION
RESOURCE CONSERVATION SEMINARS

Characteristics	Session I		Session II	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Sex				
Female	9	7%	8	22%
Male	116	93%	29	28%
No response	3		5	
Community in which they work				
Rural	74	60%	26	62%
Urban	33	27%	8	19%
Suburban	17	14%	8	19%
No response	4			
Occupation				
Teacher	9	8%	-	-
Principal	8	7%	3	9%
Superintendent	12	11%	7	21%
School board member	3	3%	-	-
Adult & continuing education	7	6%	-	-
University administrator	4	4%	3	9%
Other education	7	6%	1	3%
Maintenance/physical plant	29	25%	-	-
Business administration/planning	11	10%	16	48%
Energy consultant	8	7%	-	-
Public utilities	4	4%	-	-
Sales	4	4%	-	-
Other	8	7%	3	9%
No response	14		9	

attending the first session was to learn about energy related legislation. At the second session, the most frequently given reason was for personal interest. The participants represented several professions and included educators, consultants, planners, and maintenance personnel.

Reactions to the Panel Presentations

The participants were asked to rate the panel presentations, described earlier in this report, according to their value as a source of practical information, as a source of stimulation for discussion, and for their overall value. They used the following scale to indicate their responses: 1 - excellent, 2 - very good, 3 - good, 4 - fair, 5 - poor. As a source of practical information, the presentations were rated between "good" and "very good" at the first session and between "good" and "fair" at the second session (average ratings = 2.31 and 3.22 respectively). As a source of stimulation for discussion, the presentations also received ratings which were between "good" and "very good" at the first session and between "good" and "fair" at the second session (average ratings = 2.39 and 3.34 respectively). The overall rating was "good" at the first session (2.13) and between "good" and "fair" at the second session (3.23).

The possibility that audio difficulties during the second session may have contributed to the lower ratings is supported by the relatively high correlation between participants ratings of the sound quality and overall value of the presentations (correlation = .59).

Reactions to the Interactive Portion of the Programs

The participants were asked to react to the moderator, the panelists, and the answers they received to their questions. They were also asked to provide an overall evaluation of the interactive portions of the programs.

The majority of the participants at both sessions felt the moderator was acceptable (82% and 66% respectively). The most frequent criticism was that the moderator at the second session should have kept the seminar moving at a faster pace so that more questions could be answered. The majority of the participants at the first session felt the panelists were fine (65%) and that the answers to the questions were fine (60%). The most frequent suggestions for improvement were more frequent use of specific examples, more diversity of viewpoints, and more discussion among the panelists. The participants at the second session, however, were not so positive. Less than half were satisfied with the panelists (46%) or the answers they received to their questions (32%). The most frequent suggestions for improvement were more frequent use of examples and more diversity of viewpoints.

Overall, the interactive portions of the programs received a rating of "very good" at the first session and "good" at the second session (average ratings = 2.13 and 2.86 respectively).

As with the panel presentations, there was a strong positive correlation between participants ratings of the quality of the sound and overall value of the interactive portion of the second program (correlation = .61).

Attainment of Objectives

Each session was designed around several specific objectives which the participants were expected to achieve as a result of participating in the program. These objectives were:

Session 1 - The participants should be able to:

1. Understand how to implement specific energy conservation measures for the existing educational buildings in your area;

2. Demonstrate an awareness of the existing and impending energy conservation legislation;

3. Understand the management and technical problems involved in implementing energy conservation measures;

4. Determine which employees should attend a follow-up workshop on energy conservation.

Session 2 - The participants should be able to:

1. Demonstrate an increased understanding of how the budget relates to planning and programming at legislative, administrative, and department levels;

2. Demonstrate a greater awareness of the importance of setting priorities in the budgetary process;

3. Identify the strengths and weaknesses of zero-base budgeting.

The first objective, to understand how to implement specific energy conservation measures for the existing educational buildings in your area, was measured with three items. The participants were asked whether, as a result of the program, they had a better understanding of specific energy conservation measures that could be implemented in their area. Seventy-seven percent of the respondents agreed with this statement. The average rating was 2.06 which is "moderately agree". Eighty-seven percent of the participants knew that retrofit measures normally require a detailed energy study. Ninety-one percent of the participants were able to identify at least one quick-fix conservation measure, ninety percent identified two measures, and sixty-seven percent correctly identified all three measures listed.

The second objective, to demonstrate an awareness of the existing and impending energy conservation legislation, was measured by asking participants to react to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this program, I now have a greater awareness of energy conservation legislation." Ninety percent of the participants agreed

with this item. The average rating was 1.75 which is between "strongly agree" and "moderately agree".

The third objective, to understand the management and technical problems involved in implementing energy conservation measures was measured with three items. Participants were asked to react to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this program, I have a better understanding of the management and technical problems involved in implementing energy conservation measures." Seventy-three percent of the participants agreed with this item. The average rating was 2.15 which is "moderately agree." Participants also responded to two true-false items. Eighty-nine percent knew that energy management is as important in smaller schools as it is in larger complex institutions. Only thirty-four percent, however, knew that major modifications did not need to be considered for an energy management program to be successful. This may be due to the term "considered" being interpreted by the participants as meaning having an awareness of rather than actually planning major modifications.

Objective four, to determine which employees should attend a follow-up workshop on energy conservation, was measured with two items. Sixty-one percent of the participants agreed that they would be better able to decide which staff members would be most appropriate to attend a follow-up workshop. The average rating for this item was 2.17 which is "moderately agree." Ninety percent of the participants agreed that they would be interested in either attending, or designating other appropriate personnel to attend, a follow-up workshop.

The first objective for the second session, to demonstrate an increased understanding of how the budget relates to planning and programming at legislative,

administrative, and department levels, was measured by asking participants to react to two items on a 1 to 5 scale where 1 = strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree. Sixty-four percent of the participants agreed that they now had a better understanding of budgetary processes and sixty-four percent of the participants agreed that they now had a better understanding of the organizational implications of changes in budgetary methods. Twenty-eight percent of the participants responded neutrally to these items. The average ratings for both items were between "moderately agree" and "neutral" (average ratings = 2.44 and 2.55 respectively).

The second objective, to demonstrate a greater awareness of the importance of setting priorities in the budgetary process was measured by asking participants to react to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this program, I now have a better understanding of the organizational implications of changes in budgetary methods." Although sixty-three percent of the participants agreed with this item, thirty-three percent were neutral. The average rating was 2.30 which is between "moderately agree" and "neutral."

The third objective, to identify the strengths and weaknesses of zero-based budgeting, was measured with two multiple choice items. In the first item, eighty-three percent correctly identified short time requirements as a weakness of zero-base budgeting. The second item asked participants to identify weaknesses of zero-base budgeting. Sixty percent correctly identified one weakness, however, only twenty-nine percent were able to correctly identify both weaknesses listed.

In general, the objectives were achieved by the majority of participants at both sessions. The ambiguity of one item used to measure one of the objectives

for the first session may explain why the majority of the participants responded incorrectly to that item.

Technical Aspects

AESP site monitors rated the technical functioning of the equipment used in the programs, and participants rated the quality of the audio and video signals during the programs. The site monitors' ratings of the equipment functioning are presented in Table 8. During the first session the ATS-6 system operated with reliability of 100 percent. (No malfunctions reported). During the second session, audio distortion was reported at 7 of 11 sites reporting. Distortion occurred during both the North and South deliveries, however, it was more severe during the South delivery. Apparently some difficulty in repointing the satellite caused the distortion.

Overall, the site monitors rated the video reception at both sessions as having barely perceptible but slightly annoying distortion. The participants rated the clarity of the picture between "very good" and "good" at both sessions although the ratings were lower at the second session (average ratings = 2.22 and 2.71 respectively).

At the first session, the site monitors rated the quality of the sound as readable with practically no or no difficulty and the audio signal strength as "good" to "very good". At the second session the audio signals were rated as fair and readable with difficulty. The participants' ratings of the quality of the sound was between "good" and "very good" for the first session (average rating =2.32) and "fair" for the second session (average ratings = 3.95).

Needs Assessment Information

In order to determine possible topics for future AESP programs on other resource conservation issues, participants responded to several items

TABLE 8

SITE MONITOR'S RATINGS OF EQUIPMENT FUNCTIONING
RESOURCE CONSERVATION SEMINARS

Site		Session I		Session II	
		Audio	Video	Audio	Video
06	Greenville, SC	3 x 3	4 x 4	1 x 1	not completed
09	Tupelo, MS	3 x 3	4 x 4	2 x 2	3 x 3
10	Huntsville, AL	3 x 3	5 x 5	2 x 2	5 x 5
12	Guntersville, AL	---	---	3 x 3	4 x 4
14	Rome, GA	2 x 2	2 x 2	2 x 2	3 x 3
18	Cookeville, TN	3 x 3	5 x 5	1 x 1	4 x 4
25	Cumberland, MD	no report received		3 x 3	5 x 5
29	Altoona, PA	no report received		---	---
31	Bethany, WV	report not completed		report not completed	
35	Fredonia, NY	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5
36	Olean, NY	3 x 3	4 x 5	---	---
37	Edinboro, PA	report not completed		---	---
38	Smethport, PA	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 1	4 x 4
40	Sylva, NC	3 x 3	3 x 4	2 x 2	4 x 4
45	Gainsville, GA	2 x 2	3 x 3	---	---
55	Somerset, KY	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5

See code for audio and video rating on the following page.

Video Signal Rating Scale

Distortion and/or Noise Perceptibility

1. Picture content impossible to ascertain
2. Very perceptible distortion and/or noise but picture content ascertainable
3. Definitely perceptible distortion and/or noise
4. Barely perceptible distortion and/or noise
5. Imperceptible

Distortion and/or Noise Objectionableness

1. Extremely annoying
2. Very annoying
3. Definitely annoying
4. Slightly annoying
5. Not annoying

Audio Signal Rating Scale

Readability

1. Unreadable
2. Readable with difficulty
3. Readable with practically no difficulty or no difficulty

Signal Strength

1. Faint signals or very weak signals
2. Fair signals
3. Good signals or very good signals

in terms of their interest in attending programs on these topics. They rated each topic on a 1 to 5 scale where 1 = great interest and 5 = no interest. These ratings for session one are presented in Table 9 and for session two in Table 10.

At the first session the greatest interest was expressed in energy conservation and effect of national energy policy on regional development. Comparison of alternative budgeting methods and relationship of budgeting to administrative level received the highest ratings at the second session.

Conclusions

One hundred and eighty-two persons participated in session one and forty-seven persons participated in session two of a four-part series in resource conservation. The majority of the participants were males who were employed in rural areas in a diversity of educational, administrative, and physical plant management occupations. The participants reacted to panel presentations and interactive seminars, several cognitive and attitudinal questions, the technical quality of the broadcast, and possible topics for future programs.

The participants at the first session rated the panel presentations and the interactive portion of the program as "very good". At the second session the ratings were "good". Audio difficulties appeared to contribute to the lower ratings at the second session.

The ATS-6 system operated with 100 percent reliability during the first session. During the second session, however, audio disturbance was reported at nearly all sites.

In general the objectives were achieved by the majority of the participants at both sessions.

Needs assessment information indicates interest in future programs on other resource conservation topics.

TABLE 9

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR
FUTURE AESP PROGRAMS ON CONSERVATION ISSUES
RESOURCE CONSERVATION SEMINAR
(Session I)

Topic	Rating
1. Energy conservation	1.56
2. Effect of national energy policy on regional development	2.12
3. Environmental planning	2.31
4. Environmental programs to meet local needs	2.32
5. Regional energy environmental and socioeconomic issues	2.41
6. Integration of local needs and regional and federal environmental programs	2.42
7. Socioeconomic development related to energy planning	2.47
8. Waste disposal and/or utilization	2.50

TABLE 10

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR
FUTURE AESP PROGRAMS ON CONSERVATION ISSUES
RESOURCE CONSERVATION SEMINAR
(Session II)

Topic	Rating
1. Comparison of alternative budgeting methods	2.12
2. Relationship of budgeting to administrative level	2.16
3. Relationship of budgeting to legislative level	2.44
4. Relationship of budgeting to departmental level	2.50
5. Development and utilization of decision packages	2.74

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI'S EXTERNAL NON-DEGREE PROGRAM IN HEALTH PLANNING/ADMINISTRATION

March 6, 1978

Deborah Daugherty

The University of Cincinnati's (UC) non-residential degree program in health planning/administration is based on the concept of individualized, self-paced, student-directed learning to achieve competency goals. It is designed for persons already working in the community health system, with special emphasis on those who might not otherwise have access to graduate education. Students are not required to leave their jobs or homes; however, they are generally enrolled in geographic clusters so that they are able to meet together periodically. The program currently serves about 200 students throughout the country. Faculty/student contact is maintained through "cluster" meetings and the use of toll free telephone contact.

UC is currently seeking ways of increasing student interaction and is looking at satellite telecommunications as a possible means of augmenting their current program. In order to determine the feasibility of using telecommunications, as well as student interest in this program, the University of Cincinnati, in cooperation with the National Association of Community Health Centers (NACH) and the Appalachian Education Satellite Program (AESP), conducted a workshop on March 6, 1978. The intent of this workshop was to provide information about University of Cincinnati's non-residential external degree program in health planning and administration to persons in the region who need this training and to demonstrate or document the need for and interest in education for health professionals via satellite.

Format of the Workshop

The workshop began with short presentations of five to six minutes by each of four panelists. Each panel member related information about the University of Cincinnati's external degree program in community health planning/administration from her/his own perspective. The panelists and their topics were:

Donald A. Ostaseiwski, Co-Director of the Program in Community Health Planning, University of Cincinnati. Mr. Ostaseiwski spoke on background and the early relationship with HEW; and provided a description of the program's pace, individualism, cluster organization, degree, and cost.

Annie King Phillips, M.P.H., Director of Education and Training for the National Association of Community Health Centers, Washington, D.C. Ms. Phillips spoke on changes in health care systems, federal programs, and continuing education.

Martin B. Gerowity, PhD., Assistant Professor, Program in Community Health Planning, University of Cincinnati. Mr. Gerowity reported on course sequences and roles, and curriculum content delivery.

Pamela A. Tipton, Director, San Valley Alcoholic Recovery Residence, Tiffin, Ohio and current student in the Non-Residential Degree Program in Community Health Program, University of Cincinnati. Ms. Tipton presented a student's perspective.

The first 20 minutes consisted of the panel presentations. The remaining portion of the broadcast was devoted to a question and answer period. At the completion of the panel presentations, there was a short break to allow the participants an opportunity to formulate questions concerning educational and field administrative concerns.

During the question and answer period, participants submitted questions by telephone or by teletype. Each participant also received a folder which contained printed material designed to supplement the material presented in the televised program.

At the end of the seminar, the site monitors collected an evaluation form that each participant completed which provided information concerning the background characteristics of viewers, their reaction to the presentation,

and their perception of the technical quality of the presentation. The participants also responded to several questions designed to measure the attainment of specific cognitive and affective objectives. This information forms the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Viewers

The following results are based on evaluation instruments which were completed by 79 of the 101 persons who participated in the workshop. The frequency of participants by site is presented in Table 11, and the characteristics of participants is presented in Table 12. The majority of the participants were employed in rural areas in acute care hospitals and health centers or clinics and either held administrative positions or were nurses. Also, the majority of the audience had completed a baccalaureate degree and had been employed more than five years. Their ages were fairly evenly distributed and ranged from under 25 to 55.

Reaction to the Presentation

The participants were asked to rate the panel presentations, described earlier in this report, according to their value as a source of practical information, as a source of stimulation for discussion, and to rate their overall value. As a source of practical information, the participants rated the presentations as "good" (average rating = 2.91). The presentations were also rated as "good" (2.94) as a source of stimulation for discussion. The overall rating followed this pattern with an average rating of 2.91.

Reaction to the Interactive Seminar

The participants were asked to react to the answers they received during the seminar. The majority (52%) of respondents felt the answers to the questions were fine. The most frequent suggestions for improvement were more

TABLE 11

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE
HEALTH PLANNING/ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP

Site		Number registered	Number completing forms
06	Greenville, SC	9	7
09	Tupelo, MS	9	2
14	Rome, GA	3	2
18	Cookeville, TN	3	3
20	Norton, VA	2	2
21	Stickleyville, VA	4	4
25	Cumberland, MD	7	7
26	McHenry, MD	1	1
32	Wheeling, WV	1	1
35	Fredonia, NY	3	3
36	Olean, NY	5	5
40	Sylva, NC	3	3
42	Marion, NC	6	5
43	Asheville, NC	18	18
45	Gainesville, GA	6	0
51	Hazard, KY	6	6
55	Somerset, KY	5	5
60	Athens, OH	5	5
61	Mt. Orab, OH	5	0
TOTAL		101	79

TABLE 12

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS
HEALTH PLANNING/ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Female	45	57%
Male	33	42%
No Response	1	1%
Community in which they work		
Rural	49	62%
Urban	22	28%
Suburban	8	10%
Position held in health setting		
Administrator	20	25%
Planner	4	5%
Social Worker	5	6%
Nurse	17	22%
Counselor	4	5%
Community Aids	11	14%
Other	9	11%
No Response	9	11%
Organization where employed		
Acute care hospital	21	27%
Health center or clinic	23	29%
Special program	3	4%
Counseling or outreach center	3	4%
Educational institution	13	16%
Planning agency	4	5%
Other	11	14%
Not applicable	1	1%
Years of experience in a health related setting		
less than 1 year	9	11%
1 year - 2 years	5	6%
2 years - 5 years	11	14%
More than 5 years	49	62%
Not applicable	5	6%

TABLE 12-- CONTINUED

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Highest degree attained		
High school diploma	3	4%
Some college	5	6%
Associate degree	3	4%
Baccalaureate	49	62%
Some graduate work	14	18%
Master's	5	6%
Age		
25 or under	14	18%
26 - 35	24	30%
36 - 45	24	30%
46 - 55	17	22%

frequent use of examples and more direct answers to questions. Participants' comments reflect this general sentiment:

> "I learned what I came to find out but I would like more information on required courses."
>
> "Good program; answered questions I needed to know, time well spent."
>
> "Many answers to questions were overly wordy, not permitting answers to other questions."

The participants rated the overall value of the question and answer period as between "good" and "very good" (2.66).

Attainment of Objectives

Three specific objectives were defined for this program. These were:

1. Understand the purpose of the non-residential degree program in health planning/administration;
2. Display an awareness of the structure and content of the non-residential degree program in health planning/administration;
3. Display an interest in participating in the non-residential degree program in health planning/administration.

The first objective, to understand the purpose of the non-residential degree program in health planning/administration, was measured with two items.

The first item asked participants to respond to the following statement, "As a result of participating in this workshop, I better understand the purpose of the non-residential degree option." Eighty-eight percent of the participants moderately or strongly agreed with this statement (The average rating was 1.86 which is "moderately agree"). The second item was a true-false item concerning the number of students from isolated areas enrolled in the U.C. program. Only 18 percent of the participants knew that individual students in isolated areas do not form the bulk of the non-residential degree program. This may be due to participants responding to this item from their own perspective of living in isolated areas.

The second objective, to display an awareness of the structure and content of the non-residential degree program in health planning/administration, was measured with five items, four true-false and one attitudinal question. Ninety-five percent of the participants knew that 45 credit hours of graduate study was not the correct number of hours required for completing the program, and ninety-six percent knew that the production and acceptance of a thesis was not required. Ninety-two percent knew that the health systems approach is the latest in a series of federal attempts to deal with problems in health care and 58 percent knew that problems of health care delivery in the inner city are not currently the number one federal priority. Participants also reacted to the following statement, "As a result of participating in this workshop, I have a better understanding of the structure and content of the non-residential degree program". Eighty-three percent of the participants moderately or strongly agreed with this item. The average rating was 1.95 which is "moderately agree".

The third objective, to display an interest in participating in the non-residential degree program in health planning/administration, was measured with five multiple choice items. Although 50 percent of the participants agreed that they were interested in enrolling in the program, 37 percent were undecided. Sixty-eight percent, however, indicated that they intended to request additional information about the program. This suggests that the undecided group was interested, but needed more information about the program before they would be certain they wanted to enroll. Of those who planned to request additional information, the majority (71%) planned to use the card which was included with the materials they received. The majority of the participants (85%) felt the format of the workshop provided them with the kind of information they wanted.

The most frequent reasons given for enrolling in an external degree program rather than one on campus were the ability to maintain current employment and the distance to a campus.

Overall, the objectives for this workshop were achieved by the majority of the participants.

Technical Aspects

AESP site monitors rated the technical functioning of the equipment used in the program, and participants rated the quality of the audio and video signals during the program. The site monitors' ratings of the equipment functioning are presented in Table 13. The ATS-6 system operated with a reliability of 93 percent (1 malfunction out of 14 sites reporting). The malfunction occurred in Rome, GA where a weak signal with much snow was reported. No explanation for this difficulty was given by the site monitor.

Overall, the site monitors rated the audio signal as being readable with practically no difficulty or no difficulty and the signal strength as "good" to "very good". The participants rated the quality of sound as between "good" and "very good" (2.53).

The site monitors rated the video reception as having between imperceptible and barely perceptible distortion and the objectionableness of the distortion as between "not annoying" and "slightly annoying". The average rating of the clarity of the picture by the participants was between "good" and "very good" (2.72).

Conclusions

One hundred and one persons participated in the workshop dealing with the non-residential degree program in health planning/administration. Complete data were available for seventy-nine participants. The participants reacted to

TABLE 13

SITE MONITOR'S RATINGS OF EQUIPMENT FUNCTIONING
HEALTH PLANNING/ADMINISTRATION WORKSHOP

	Site	Audio	Video
06	Greenville, SC	3 x 3	4 x 5
09	Tupelo, MS	3 x 3	4 x 4
14	Rome, GA	2 x 2	3 x 3
18	Cookeville, TN	3 x 3	5 x 5
20	Norton, VA	3 x 3	4 x 4
21	Stickleyville, VA	3 x 3	5 x 5
25	Cumberland, MD	Report not received	Report not received
26	McHenry, MD	3 x 3	5 x 5
32	Wheeling, WV	Report not received	Report not received
35	Fredonia, NY	3 x 3	5 x 5
36	Olean, NY	Report not received	Report not received
40	Sylva, NC	3 x 3	5 x 5
42	Marion, NC	3 x 3	4 x 4
43	Asheville, NC	Report not completed	Report not completed
45	Gainesville, GA	2 x 2	4 x 4
51	Hazard, KY	Report not completed	5 x 5
55	Somerset, KY	3 x 3	5 x 5
60	Athens, OH	3 x 3	4 x 4
61	Mt. Orab, OH	3 x 3	4 x 4

See code for audio and video rating on the following page.

Video Signal Rating Scale

Distortion and/or Noise Perceptibility

1. Picture content impossible to ascertain
2. Very perceptible distortion and/or noise but picture content ascertainable
3. Definitely perceptible distortion and/or noise
4. Barely perceptible distortion and/or noise
5. Imperceptible

Distortion and/or Noise Objectionableness

1. Extremely annoying
2. Very annoying
3. Definitely annoying
4. Slightly annoying
5. Not annoying

Audio Signal Rating Scale

Readability

1. Unreadable
2. Readable with difficulty
3. Readable with practically no difficulty or no difficulty

Signal Strength

1. Faint signals or very weak signals
2. Fair signals
3. Good signals or very good signals

panel presentations, an interactive question and answer period, several cognitive and attitudinal questions, and the technical quality of the broadcast.

The panel presentations received an overall rating of "good." The question and answer portion of the program was rated between "good" and "very good." The most frequent suggestions for improvement were a need for more specific examples and more direct answers to the questions.

In general, the objectives for the workshop were attained by the majority of the participants.

The ATS-6 system operated with a reliability of 93 percent during this workshop and the quality of both the audio and video was rated between "good" and "very good" overall. One audio-video malfunction was reported at Rome, GA. No explanation was given for the malfunction.

DEVELOPING A POSITIVE SELF-IMAGE:

"OVERVIEW AND WORKING WITH THE YOUNG CHILD" AND

"THE ADOLESCENT'S SELF-IMAGE AND THE ADULT'S SELF-IMAGE"

March 13 and April 10

Lea J. Perritt

Introduction

One of the major differences between persons with high and low self-concepts is the way they perceive themselves. Individuals with a positive self-concept who see themselves as liked, acceptable, and competent will behave as though they are liked, acceptable, and competent. Likewise, individuals who see themselves as inadequate, unliked, and unacceptable will behave as though they are inadequate, unliked, and unacceptable. Mental health then depends to a great extent on one's self-perception.

Self-concept development continues throughout one's life, although the early years are the most formative. Parents and teachers play a significant role in a child's self-concept development and there are many ways that they can be instrumental in helping children develop positive self-concepts.

In order to help parents and teachers become more aware of the importance of self-concept and learn strategies and techniques they could use in helping children build more positive self-concepts, AESP developed and delivered a two-part workshop entitled "Developing a Positive Self-Image."

Format of the Workshop

The content of the two sessions was based on a series of videotapes titled "Or Would You Rather Be...?" developed by the Chautauqua County

Board of Cooperative Education Services (BOCES) in Fredonia, New York. Each session included presentation of two of the videotapes from the series, short panel discussions after each videotape, an interactive seminar, and on-site activities following the live broadcast.

In the first session, the first two segments of the series, "The Importance of Self-Image" and "The Child's Self-Image" were broadcast. These segments provide an overview of self-concept theory and then deal specifically with self-concept development in the young child at home and school.

In the second session, the last two segments of the series were broadcast. These were titled "The Adolescent's Self-Image" and the "Adult's Self-Image." These segments follow the development of self-concept in the adolescent as he/she examines his/her beliefs and behaviors, and also help the adult examine the positive and negative traits which contribute to one's own self-image. In addition, an action plan is described for achieving one's goals in life.

A five minute panel discussion followed each videotaped segment. This discussion was designed to clarify the material presented and to stimulate participant discussion.

Following the films, participants were given an opportunity to direct questions via teletype or telephone to panel members located in the television studios in Lexington, Kentucky. The seminars were produced by AESP's Media Services Component in the University of Kentucky Television Studios. The panel for the first session consisted of the following persons:

Arleen Rubin, Teacher, Westfield Central School, Westfield, NY

Gerald Hilfiker, Parent, Boston, NY

Dr. Charles Thompson, Educational Psychology Department, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN

In addition, June Parker, Elementary Counselor, John Servier Elementary School, Maryville, TN participated in a telephone segment.

The panel members for the second session included the following persons:

Zenon Deputat, Health Teacher, North Tonawanda Schools, Tonawanda, NY

Vito La Barbera, Health Teacher, Silver Creek Central School, Silver Creek, NY

Dr. Martin Levy, Department of Health Education, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA

Both sessions were moderated by Alice Beckman, Director, AESP NY/PA Cluster, Fredonia, NY.

Each participant also received a manual which included additional strategies for developing and improving self-concept as well as supplementary readings and a list of related media and organizations.

At the end of each session, participants completed a brief evaluation designed to determine their reaction to the program. This information forms the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Viewers

The analysis of participant reaction was conducted separately for each session. A total of 243 persons at 20 AESP sites attended the first session. One hundred and ninety-two persons at 19 sites registered at the second session originally scheduled for March 20. This program was cancelled due to technical difficulties and only 63 persons at 7 sites attended the rebroadcast on April 10. Twenty-six of these 63 persons attended the first session as well. At the first session participants were asked whether they planned to attend the second session and 164 (77%) indicated they did

plan to attend. Evaluation forms were received from 212 (87%) participants at the first session and 62 (98%) at the second session. The frequency of participants by site for each session is presented in Table 14. Table 15 presents the background characteristics of the participants who completed the evaluation forms.

The participants at both sessions were similar with respect to sex, type of community in which they work, and occupation. The majority of the participants at both sessions were females and were employed in rural communities. Teaching was the occupation listed most frequently by the participants at both sessions (49% and 41% respectively) and, at the second session, an increased percentage were nurses (22%).

Approximately two thirds of the participants at each session were parents. The ages of their children ranged from 7 months to 39 years with a mean age of 10 at the first session and 15 at the second session. At both sessions, the most frequent reason given for attending the workshop was personal interest.

Reaction to the Videotapes

The participants were asked to give an overall evaluation of the videotapes described earlier in this report. They used the following scale to indicate their responses: 1 - excellent, 2 - very good, 3 - good, 4 - fair, 5 - poor. The films viewed at the first session both received average ratings of "very good" (average ratings = 2.20 and 2.15 respectively). The videotapes viewed at the second session received differential ratings. The first videotape "The Adolescent's Self-Image" received a rating of 2.55 which is between "good" and "very good" while the videotape "The Adult's Self-Image" received a higher rating of "very good" (average rating

TABLE 14

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE AND SESSION
SELF-IMAGE WORKSHOPS

AESP Sites	Session I		Session II	
	Number registered	Number completing forms	Number* registered	Number completing forms
06 Greenville, SC	16	16	5 (10)	4
07 Spartanburg, SC	6	6	(1)	
09 Tupelo, MS	34	31	36	36
10 Huntsville, AL	7	7	(11)	
12 Guntersville, AL	-	-	(7)	
13 Gadsden, AL	-	-	(26)	
15 Lafollette, TN	-	-	(9)	
18 Cookeville, TN	3	3	(3)	
19 McMinnville, TN	1	1	(1)	
34 Chattanooga, TN	21	13	2 (26)	2
20 Norton, VA	3	3	(2)	
22 Boone, NC	8	7	(7)	
25 Cumberland, MD	-	-	(2)	
26 McHenry, MD	2	2	(2)	
32 Wheeling, WV	7	7	(6)	
35 Fredonia, NY	30	27	(23)	
36 Olean, NY	26	26	(25)	
38 Smethport, PA	21	10	10 (20)	10
40 Sylva, NC	7	7	4 (8)	4
42 Marion, NC	7	6	1	1
45 Gainesville, GA	16	10	5	5
51 Hazard, KY	9	7		
60 Athens, OH	6	5	(3)	
61 Mt. Orab, OH	13	12		
Total	243	212	63 (192)	62

* Numbers in parenthesis indicate registrants at cancelled broadcast 3-20-78.

TABLE 15

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS BY SESSION
SELF-IMAGE WORKSHOPS

Characteristics	Session I		Session II	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Sex:				
Female	169	80%	52	87%
Male	42	20%	8	13%
No response	1		2	
Community in which they work:				
Rural	105	52%	33	57%
Urban	59	29%	20	34%
Suburban	38	19%	5	9%
No response	10		4	
Occupation:				
Teacher	102	49%	24	41%
Psychologist/counselor	19	9%	4	7%
Social worker	14	7%	2	3%
Nurse	15	7%	13	22%
Adminstrator	14	7%	3	5%
Minister	4	2%	0	0%
Student	12	6%	3	5%
Homemaker	6	3%	1	2%
Parent	11	5%	6	10%
Other	11	5%	3	5%
No response	4		3	
Reason for attending workshop:*				
Personal interest	169	80%	48	79%
Requested by supervisor	17	8%	9	15%
Lead-in-service program	31	15%	10	16%
Help in job	16	8%	4	7%
Class assignment	8	4%	1	2%
Other	-	-	2	3%
No response	-		1	
Ages of children: *				
0 - 4	44	15%	9	10%
5 - 10	66	23%	17	19%
11 - 13	42	15%	13	15%
14 - 18	65	22%	26	29%
19 and over	72	25%	24	27%

*Includes multiple responses

= 2.05). Comments made by participants suggested that lack of detail in the first videotape may have contributed to the somewhat lower ratings.

Reaction to the Panel Discussions, Phone Patch, and On-Site Activities

The participants were asked to rate the short panel discussions which followed each film using a 1 to 5 scale where 1 = excellent, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = fair, and 5 = poor. The panel discussions received an overall rating which was "good" at the first session, and between "good" and "very good" at the second session (average ratings = 2.83 and 2.63 respectively). The comments given by participants gave no indication as to why these short discussions were not rated higher.

The participants also rated the phone patches which were used during both sessions. During the first session, the phone patch was used to allow a panel member who was not located in the studio to participate, via telephone, in the program. During the second session, the phone patch was used to obtain the immediate reaction of a preselected site to an on-site activity. The respondents' ratings of the phone patch at the first session were between "neutral" and "moderately agree" (average rating = 2.51). Comments suggested that it was extremely difficult to hear the speaker over the phone which may have contributed to this relatively low rating. The participants reacted more positively to contacting one site for their immediate reaction to an on-site activity, agreeing that this was an effective means of stimulating questions and answers (average rating = 2.15).

The participants also reacted to the effectiveness of the on-site activities in helping them understand the concepts presented in the videotapes. At both sessions they moderately agreed that the activities were effective (average ratings = 2.12 and 2.22 respectively).

Reactions to the Interactive Seminars

The participants were asked to react to the seminar moderator and to the answers they received during the seminars. They were also asked to provide an overall evaluation of the seminars. The majority of the participants felt the moderator was fine (58% and 66% respectively). The most frequent suggestion for improvement at both sessions was to keep the seminar moving at a faster pace so that more questions could be answered.

The participants were not so favorable about the answers they received to their questions. Only 29 percent were satisfied with the answers they received during the first session and only 31 percent at the second session were satisfied. The most frequent suggestion for improvement at both sessions was more frequent use of specific examples. Overall, the seminars received ratings between "good" and "very good" (average ratings = 2.52 and 2.50 respectively).

Although many of the comments made by the participants were positive, others were not so favorable:

- Answers too long at times.
- Sometimes I felt the panel didn't answer questions.
- The moderator and panel participants were very informative.
- All questions were too much alike.
- One of the better workshops offered to date.
- Needed more specific strategies and gear to a higher level.

The site monitors rated student satisfaction with the seminar as very good for the first session and as good at the second session. However, the results for the second session are based on the responses of only two sites.

Attainment of Objectives

Several specific objectives were defined for each program. These were:

Workshop #1 - The participants should be able to:

1. Demonstrate an awareness of the importance of self-concept;
2. Demonstrate an understanding of how a person develops self-concept;
3. Demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between feelings, behavior, and self-concept;
4. Identify ways to increase self-concept.

Workshop #2 - The participants should be able to:

1. Identify three strategies one can use to help adolescents examine their behavior;
2. Identify a specific action plan for achieving one's own goals;
3. Demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between feelings, behavior, and self-concept;
4. Demonstrate through proper use of listening skills the attitude and feelings which lie beneath the "words" a speaker is using.

The first objective, to demonstrate an awareness of the importance of self-concept was measured by asking participants whether they would be able to use the strategies to develop self-concept and if they could, whether they would try at least one of the techniques. The ratings for both of these items were between "strongly agree" and "moderately agree." Ninety-three percent of the participants agreed that they could use the strategies and 92 percent agreed that they intended to try using the techniques.

The second objective, to demonstrate an understanding of how a person develops self-concept, was measured using two items. The first item asked participants to react to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this program, I now have a greater awareness of the need for positive reinforcement in developing self-concept."

Eighty-three percent of the participants agreed with this statement. The average rating was 1.70 which is between "strongly agree" and "moderately agree." The second item used to measure this objective was a multiple choice item. Eighty-four percent of the participants knew that self-concept is a learned response, 71 percent knew that it is reflected by actions and words of others, and 70 percent knew that it is subject to change.

The third objective, to demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between feelings, behavior, and self-concept, was measured by asking participants to react to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this program, I now have a better understanding of the relationship between feelings, self-concept and behavior." Eighty-one percent of the participants agreed with this item. The average rating was 1.84 which is "moderately agree."

The fourth objective, to identify ways to increase self-concept, was measured by asking participants to respond to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this program, I have a better understanding of specific strategies and techniques for developing better self-concepts in others." Eighty-two percent of the participants agreed with this item. The average rating was 2.15 which is moderately agree.

Objective one for the second session, to identify three strategies one can use to help adolescents examine their behavior, was measured by asking participants to list three strategies which could be used with adolescents in examining their behavior. Forty-eight percent of the participants listed three strategies and 3 percent listed two strategies. Forty-eight percent did not list any strategies. This

item requires recall rather than recognition which is a higher level response. This may account for the large number of participants who did not list any strategies.

Objective two, to identify a specific action plan for achieving one's own goals, was measured with a multiple choice item which asked participants to identify the steps needed in an action plan. Ninety-five percent correctly identified at least one step, 91 percent identified two steps, and 89 percent were able to identify all three steps listed.

Objective three, to demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between feelings, behavior, and self-concept, was measured with two items. The participants were asked to respond to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this workshop, I now have a better understanding of the relationship between feelings, self-concept, and behavior." Eighty percent of the participants agreed with this item. The average rating was 1.92 which is "moderately agree". Participants were also asked to identify characteristics of self-concept. Seventy-five percent of the participants were able to correctly identify at least one characteristic, 62 percent identified at least two characteristics, and 61 percent were able to identify all three characteristics listed.

Objective four, to demonstrate through proper use of listening skills the attitudes and feelings which lie beneath the "words" a speaker is using, was measured by asking participants to respond to three statements on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = strongly agree, 2 = moderately agree, 3 = neutral, 4 = moderately disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree. The ratings for all three statements were between moderately and strongly agree. Eighty-eight percent of the participants agreed that they had a

better understanding of specific strategies and techniques as a result of participating in the workshop, 94 percent agreed that they would be able to use the techniques and 95 percent indicated they intended to try the strategies and techniques.

In general, the objectives for both sessions were achieved by the majority of the participants. One objective was measured by asking for recall rather than recognition which may account for the lower level of achievement for this objective.

Technical Aspects

AESP site monitors rated the technical functioning of the equipment used in the program and participants rated the quality of the audio and video signals during the program. The site monitors' ratings of the equipment functioning are presented in Table 16. During the first session, the ATS-6 system operated with moderate effectiveness. Four sites, Spartanburg, SC; Norton, VA; Cookeville, TN; and Fredonia, NY, reported weak audio reception. Hazard, KY reported poor color in their television picture. None of these difficulties resulted in disruption of the broadcast. The second session, which was originally scheduled for March 20, was postponed because of transmitter failure in Lexington. Only four sites returned equipment reports for the rebroadcast on April 10, and no technical difficulties were reported.

Overall, the site monitors rated the video reception as having barely perceptible but slightly annoying distortion at the first session and as having distortion which was between barely perceptible and imperceptible and between slightly and not annoying at the second session. The participants rated the clarity of the picture between "good" and "very good" for both sessions (average ratings = 2.52 and 2.40 respectively).

TABLE 16

SITE MONITORS' RATINGS OF EQUIPMENT FUNCTIONING
SELF-IMAGE WORKSHOPS

Site		Session I		Session II	
		Audio	Video	Audio	Video
06	Greenville, SC	2 x 2	3 x 4	3 x 3	4 x 4
07	Spartanburg, SC	2 x 2	4 x 4	---	---
09	Tupelo, MS	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5
10	Huntsville, AL	3 x 2	4 x 4	---	---
18	Cookeville, TN	3 x 3	5 x 5	---	---
19	McMinnville, TN	3 x 3	5 x 5	---	---
34	Chattanooga, TN	3 x 3	3 x 3	report not received	
20	Norton, VA	3 x 3	4 x 4	---	---
22	Boone, NC	report not received		---	---
26	McHenry, MD	3 x 3	5 x 5	---	---
32	Wheeling, WV	broadcast from TV station		---	---
35	Fredonia, NY	3 x 3	5 x 5	---	---
36	Olean, NY	3 x 3	4 x 4	---	---
38	Smethport, PA	report not completed		report not received	
40	Sylva, NC	2 x 2	4 x 4	3 x 3	4 x 5
42	Marion, NC	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5
45	Gainesville, GA	2 x 2	2 x 2	report not received	
51	Hazard, KY	3 x 3	4 x 4	---	---
60	Athens, OH	3 x 3	4 x 4	---	---
61	Mt. Orab, OH	2 x 2	2 x 2	---	---

Overall, the site monitors at the first session rated the audio signal as readable with practically no difficulty and fair to good signal strength. At the second session, the audio reception was rated as readable with practically no or no difficulty and good to very good signal strength. The participants' ratings of the quality of the sound were "good" for the first session (average rating = 3.06) and between "good" and "very good" for the second session (average rating = 2.58).

Needs Assessment Information

In order to determine possible topics for future programs in the area of human relations, participants were asked to respond to several topics in terms of their interest in participating in a program on each topic. They rated the topics using a 1 to 5 scale where 1 indicated great interest and 5 indicated no interest.

The results of these ratings for session one are presented in Table 17 and for session two in Table 18. The ratings indicated average to above average interest in nearly all the topics rated (all 22 items in session one and 21 out of 22 items in session two). This indicates a general interest in human relations topics. The strongest interest at the first session was in parent effectiveness methods. At the second session the strongest interest was in human relations skills for adults and adolescents. The least interest expressed was in counseling techniques at the first session and motivational techniques at the second session. Participants at the second session expressed lower interest in techniques for preschool and elementary children which may be a result of the older age of the participants' children at this session. The results of these ratings are presented in Tables 19, 20, 21, and 22.

TABLE 17

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS IN HUMAN RELATIONS AREAS (SESSION I)
SELF-IMAGE WORKSHOP

Topic	Target Age Group	Rating
Parent effectiveness methods	Elementary	1.71
Parent effectiveness methods	Preschool	1.77
Self-image techniques	Adolescents	1.84
Parent effectiveness methods	Adolescents	1.84
Self-image techniques	Adults	1.85
Self-image techniques	Elementary	1.85
Improving communication skills	Elementary	1.87
Improving communication skills	Adolescents	1.88
Improving communication skills	Preschool	1.90
Motivational techniques	Adolescents	1.92
Self-image techniques	Preschool	1.94
Improving communication skills	Adults	1.94
Motivational techniques	Elementary	1.96
Counseling techniques	Adolescents	1.97
Discipline methods	Preschool	1.97
Discipline methods	Elementary	1.98
Motivational techniques	Preschool	2.02
Discipline methods	Adolescents	2.10
Motivational techniques	Adults	2.15
Counseling techniques	Elementary	2.24
Counseling techniques	Adults	2.26
Counseling techniques	Preschool	2.37

TABLE 18

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS IN HUMAN RELATIONS AREAS (SESSION II)

SELF-IMAGE WORKSHOP

Topic	Target Age Group	Rating
Improving communication skills	Adults	1.60
Self-image techniques	Adults	1.74
Counseling techniques	Adolescents	1.74
Discipline methods	Adolescents	1.75
Counseling techniques	Adults	1.79
Improving communication skills	Adolescents	1.83
Motivational techniques	Adults	1.84
Motivational techniques	Adolescents	1.84
Parent effectiveness methods	Adolescents	1.86
Self-image techniques	Adolescents	1.95
Parent effectiveness methods	Elementary	2.12
Discipline methods	Elementary	2.23
Parent effectiveness methods	Preschool	2.31
Counseling techniques	Elementary	2.41
Motivational techniques	Elementary	2.54
Self-image techniques	Elementary	2.57
Discipline methods	Preschool	2.58
Improving communication skills	Elementary	2.59
Self-image techniques	Preschool	2.66
Improving communication skills	Preschool	2.77
Motivational techniques	Preschool	2.88
Counseling techniques	Preschool	3.06

TABLE 19

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
BY HUMAN RELATIONS AREA (SESSION I)
SELF-IMAGE WORKSHOP

Topic	Average rating
Parent effectiveness methods	1.77
Self-image techniques	1.87
Improving communication skills	1.90
Motivational techniques	2.01
Discipline methods	2.02
Counseling techniques	2.21

TABLE 20

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
BY HUMAN RELATIONS AREA (SESSION II)
SELF-IMAGE WORKSHOP

Topic	Average rating
Parent effectiveness methods	2.10
Discipline methods	2.19
Improving communication skills	2.20
Self-image techniques	2.23
Counseling techniques	2.25
Motivational techniques	2.27

TABLE 21

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
BY TARGET AGE GROUP (SESSION I)
SELF-IMAGE WORKSHOP

Target Group	Average Rating
Adolescent	1.92
Elementary	1.93
Preschool	1.99
Adult	2.05

TABLE 22

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS OF INTEREST FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS
BY TARGET AGE GROUP (SESSION II)
SELF-IMAGE WORKSHOP

Target Group	Average Rating
Adult	1.74
Adolescent	1.83
Elementary	2.41
Preschool	2.71

Participants also indicated whether they would be interested in attending additional programs on other human relations topics. The majority of the participants at both sessions (90%) indicated they would be interested in attending other workshops (86% and 90% respectively) or a course (66% and 70% respectively) and that they would be willing to pay a small fee for participating (86% and 93% respectively). The majority of the participants also indicated they would be interested in receiving college credit (65% and 76% respectively) with graduate level credit being preferred more frequently than undergraduate credit.

Conclusions

Two hundred forty-three persons participated in session one of a two-part workshop on self-concept development. One hundred ninety-two persons originally registered for session two. However, the session was postponed because of technical difficulties and 63 persons attended the rescheduled second session.

The participants reacted to the videotapes, the panel discussions, the phone patch, the on-site activities, and the interactive seminars. They also responded to several cognitive and attitudinal questions, the technical quality of the broadcast, and topics for possible future programs.

Three of the four videotapes viewed were rated very good. "The Adolescent's Self-Image" received a somewhat lower rating which was between good and very good. Comments indicated that this film was not specific enough.

The panel discussion was rated as good at the first session and between good and very good at the second session. The phone patch used during the first session was difficult to hear, and therefore not rated highly. The quality of the phone patch used during the second session,

however, was acceptable and the participants' reaction was more favorable. At both sessions, the majority of the participants felt the on-site activities were effective. The interactive seminars were rated between good and very good at both sessions. The most frequent suggestion for improvement was more use of specific examples.

In general, both the cognitive and attitudinal objectives were achieved by the majority of participants at both sessions.

During the first session, several sites reported reduced audio or video quality, however, none of these difficulties resulted in interruptions in the program. The second session, which was originally scheduled for March 20, was postponed because of transmitter failure. No difficulties were reported when the session was broadcast on April 10.

Needs assessment information indicated a high interest in human relations topics, particularly parent effectiveness methods, self-image techniques, and communication skills. Participants also indicated interest in attending additional workshops and college credit courses and the majority were willing to pay a small fee to participate.

AESP ADVISORY BOARD TELECONFERENCE

March 27, 1978

Donna M. Mertens

The Appalachian Education Satellite Program (AESP) is a region-wide telecommunications system which provides courses, workshops and special programs in the five identified need areas of health, education, business and industry, human resources and government. The AESP has selected a group of local agencies and organizations to operate 45 receive sites for the dissemination of its programs. The receive sites of a geographical area have been grouped into 13 clusters to facilitate the coordination, management and operation of the program and to encourage interstate and interagency cooperation.

A cluster director has been assigned responsibility for each group of receive sites. Each cluster director has organized an advisory board, including members from each of the five identified need areas. The purpose of the advisory board is to provide local input concerning program recommendations and the identification of user needs.

In order to acquaint advisory board members with AESP and to provide them with a means for input, AESP conducted an Advisory Board Teleconference on March 27, 1978. Each cluster director invited the members of the board to attend the session.

Format of the Teleconference

The teleconference consisted of an audio-video presentation via satellite followed by an interactive session of one-way video and two-way audio. The cluster directors then conducted on-site activities in order to obtain a written record of the advisory board's reactions to the

teleconference and potential program topics. The purpose of the audio-video presentation was to present an overview of the AESP, including a brief history, and a description of the organizational structure, agency involvement, delivery system and future directions. The role of the advisory board was then explained during the teleconference.

During the interactive session, advisory board members could direct questions to a panel in the University of Kentucky television studio. The panel consisted of:

Hal Morse, Director of AESP and Director of Education for the Appalachian Regional Commission

Rob Shuman, Deputy Director of AESP

Nofflet Williams, Director of AESP Resource Coordinating Center

Wylie Wood, Cluster Director at Tupelo, MS

Renetta Evans, Chautauqua Co. Advisory Board member

Questions were transmitted from the receive sites to the studio via telephone and teletype and were answered during the broacast.

Following the satellite broadcast, the advisory board members completed an evaluation form designed to provide information concerning their reactions to the format of the teleconference and to various program topics. Their responses to these questions provide the basis for the remainder of this report.

Participation by Site

Table 23 presents the frequency of participants and the frequency of evaluation forms returned by site. In some cases (e.g. Cumberland, MD), all of the board members were unable to attend the session and their responses were obtained by mailing the forms to them. A total of 113 persons attended the teleconference and forms were returned from 99 persons at 19 sites. Table 24 presents the distribution of advisory

TABLE 23

FREQUENCY OF FORMS RETURNED BY SITE FOR ADVISORY COUNCIL TELECONFERENCE

Site	Frequency of Registrants	Frequency of Forms Returned
06 Greenville, SC	13	13
09 Tupelo, MS	16	11
10 Huntsville, AL	3	2
11 Rainsville, AL	3	0
12 Guntersville, AL	4	3
13 Gadsden, AL	1	1
18 Cookeville, TN	12	8
20 Norton, VA	5	5
24 Dublin, VA	8	8
25 Cumberland, MD	1	9
32 Wheeling, WV	6	5
35 Fredonia, NY	6	3
36 Olean, NY	2	2
38 Smethport, PA	3	3
40 Sylva, NC	8	5
45 Gainesville, GA	4	3
51 Hazard, KY	4	6
55 Somerset, KY	7	6
60 Athens, OH	7	6
Total	113	99

TABLE 24

FREQUENCY OF ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS BY OCCUPATIONAL AREAS

Occupational Area	Frequency
Education	42
Business and industry	18
Human resources	11
Government	10
Medicine and health	15
No response	3

board members by occupational area. The most frequent representation is in the area of education (42) and the least represented area is government (10).

Reaction to the Teleconference

The board members' responses to the format of the teleconference were ascertained by asking two questions concerning its effectiveness and its usefulness and interest value. The respondents used a 5-point scale to respond, with 1 indicating strongly agree and 5 indicating strongly disagree. In response to the item, "The format of the teleconference used today was effective", the board members indicated moderate agreement ($\bar{X}$ = 1.99). They also tended to moderately agree with the statement, "The information presented in the teleconference was useful and interesting" ($\bar{X}$ = 1.85).

Participants' comments indicated suggested areas for improvement:

"It was informative but the explanation at the beginning was too drawn out."

"Be briefer - get to the point - use more visuals."

"More active dialogue would have been more interesting than several monologues. Question-answer session much better."

"More examples of current programs and possibilities would be more effective."

Other participants' comments indicated a favorable reaction to the teleconference:

"This presentation is a clear overview of the project and could be shown to other groups as a way of promoting it."

"The teleconference was especially interesting and useful to me because of my lack of knowledge concerning the program. It gave me an excellent overview of what the program is all about and what it attempts to do."

In summary, the reaction to the concept of the teleconference was positive. However, in the future such teleconferences should be more carefully planned in order to eliminate redundancy in the presentations and to provide more appropriate visual support for the presentations. In addition, a longer interactive session was indicated as being desirable. If future AESP teleconferences incorporate the above suggestions, this format of interaction with advisory boards appears to be quite effective, useful and interesting.

Reaction to Program Topics

The advisory board members were presented with a list of 19 topics and short descriptions of each topic for potential programs to be broadcast over the AESP system. They were instructed to rate the topics according to their interest in having a workshop in their community using a 5-point scale, with 1 indicating great interest and 5 indicating no interest. The results of their ratings were analyzed aggregately as well as by occupational area. In addition to rating these nineteen topics, board members were instructed to list additional topics that were of interest to them and to select three of the topics as their highest priorities.

Overall Rating. The overall ratings for the topics are presented in Table 25. While these results are of general interest, the actual AESP programs are designed for a specific target population. Therefore, a more appropriate analysis of the results appears to be by occupational group.

Educational Ratings. The priority ratings of the educational representatives are presented in Table 26. These results suggest areas

TABLE 25

AVERAGE RATINGS FOR WORKSHOPS BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

	Topics	Average Rating	n
1.	Training for parents of the severely handicapped	2.05	93
2.	Parent education	2.21	95
3.	Emergency medical services board training	2.22	95
4.	Presentation on the American Nursing Association's training program for nurses in rural areas	2.39	91
5.	Ancillary hospital training	2.42	92
6.	Family counseling for social workers	2.51	90
7.	Workshop on Smithsonian Institute's "Reading is Fundamental" program	2.54	90
8.	Teaching adult basic education	2.57	89
9.	Energy conservation for educators	2.67	92
10.	Workshop on proposal writing	2.69	88
11.	Staff training for senior center workers	2.78	93
12.	Crib death	2.80	93
13.	Workshop on police/community relations in Appalachia	2.88	89
14.	Women in management	2.91	90
15.	Appalachian culture	2.91	89
16.	Workshop on local tax assessment	3.06	92
17.	Fire fighter training	3.12	89
18.	Workshop on rural American women	3.48	90
19.	Workshop on public maintenance	3.48	87

TABLE 26

AVERAGE RATINGS BY EDUCATION MEMBERS OF ADVISORY BOARD

	Topics	Average Rating	n
1.	Training for parents of the severely handicapped	1.82	40
2.	Parent education	2.03	39
3.	Energy conservation for educators	2.24	41
4.	Ancillary hospital training	2.27	41
5.	Teaching adult basic education	2.27	41
6.	Family counseling for social workers	2.32	41
7.	Emergency medical services board training	2.32	41
8.	Workshop on Smithsonian Institute's "Reading is Fundamental" program	2.39	41
9.	Appalachian culture	2.54	39
10.	Workshop on proposal writing	2.55	40
11.	Presentation on the American Nursing Association's training program for nurses in rural areas	2.56	39
12.	Workshop on police/community relations	2.80	39
13.	Crib death	2.81	41
14.	Women in management	2.82	39
15.	Workshop on local tax assessment	2.83	42
16.	Staff training for senior center workers	2.93	41
17.	Fire fighter training	3.05	37
18.	Workshop on public maintenance	3.28	39
19.	Workshop on rural American women	3.49	39

on which AESP should focus attention, however, a number of the topics raise more questions than they answer. Based on the educators' ratings of the top ten items, the following recommendations are made:

1. Training for parents of the severely handicapped. If such a program is to be successfully implemented, several feasibility issues must be addressed such as identification of the parents, out-reach and follow-up.

2. Parent education. Several questions must be addressed before parent education programs can be successfully delivered. These include: Who is the specific target audience? What aspects of parenting should be included? Will parents attend a program at a receiving site? What age range of children should be included?

3. Energy conservation for educators. Workshops on the topic of resource conservation for educators have been prepared by a cooperative effort between AESP and Maryland RESA in Cumberland. Reports of these workshops will be available in 1978 Spring and Summer AESP technical reports.

4. Ancillary hospital training. This priority area falls outside of the purview of education and will be discussed in the medical and health section of this report.

5. Teaching adult basic education. This topic presents many of the same feasibility questions as parent education. For example: Should the target audience be the adult learner or the teacher of adults? Will such a target audience attend a program at a receiving site? Should the focus of the program be on basic skill areas such as reading or arithmetic or should it be on a more general topic such as metrics or consumer affairs?

6. Family counseling for social workers. This topic falls out of the purview of education and will be discussed in the human resource section of this report.

7. Emergency medical services board training. This topic is discussed in the medical and health section of this report.

8. Smithsonian Institute's "Reading Is Fundamental". Preliminary discussions are underway between AESP and RIF personnel and a workshop is tentatively planned for the Fall of 1978.

9. Appalachian culture. Preliminary discussions are underway between AESP and Foxfire, Inc. personnel to plan a workshop or series of workshops that demonstrate techniques for the application of the Foxfire concept throughout Appalachia.

10. Workshop on proposal writing. A group of technical experts in proposal writing have not yet been identified to work cooperatively with AESP to plan a workshop on proposal writing. The identification of such experts is the next step in the planning process.

The education representatives were asked to list additional topics for consideration. No consistent pattern of responses was indicated, therefore, this information is not reported here. The responses will be used as appropriate as a basis for developing further inquiries into educational needs.

The selection of three priority topics by educational representatives yielded corroborating evidence for the ten priorities listed above. The topics which were mentioned by more than one person are displayed in Table 27.

Business and Industry Ratings. The ratings of the business and industry representatives are presented in Table 28. The number of representatives from business and industry was small (18), therefore, these results should be interpreted cautiously. Of the top ten priorities of the business and industry group, one relates directly to the medical and health group (emergency medical services board training)

TABLE 27

PRIORITY TOPICS LISTED BY EDUCATION MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL

Topics	Frequency
1. Parent education	11
2. Training of parents of severely handicapped	10
3. Appalachian culture	7
4. Reading is Fundamental	6
5. Proposal writing	6
6. Family counseling for social workers	4
7. Emergency medical services board training	4
8. Local tax assessment	3
9. Energy conservation for educators	3
10. Ancillary hospital training	3
11. Fire fighters	3
12. Energy conservation for home owners	3
13. ANA program for nurses	3
14. Crib death	3
15. Police/community relations	3
16. Adult basic education	2
17. Women in management	2
18. Teaching techniques	2
19. Continuing education for nurses	2
20. Staff training for senior center workers	2

TABLE 28

AVERAGE RATINGS BY BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY MEMBERS OF ADVISORY BOARD

	Topics	Average Rating	n
1.	Emergency medical services board training	2.25	16
2.	Workshop on Smithsonian Institute's "Reading Is Fundamental" program	2.31	16
3.	Training for parents of the severely handicapped	2.39	18
4.	Workshop on police/community relations	2.56	16
5.	Energy conservation for educators	2.59	17
6.	Fire fighter training	2.61	18
7.	Teaching adult basic education	2.62	16
8.	Parent education	2.65	17
9.	Workshop on local tax assessment	2.78	18
10.	Women in management	2.88	17
11.	Presentation on the American Nursing Association	3.07	15
12.	Workshop on proposal writing	3.14	14
13.	Ancillary hospital training	3.20	15
14.	Staff training for senior center workers	3.31	16
15.	Family counseling for social workers	3.31	16
16.	Appalachian culture	3.47	17
17.	Crib death	3.75	16
18.	Workshop on public maintenance	3.87	15
19.	Workshop on rural American women	3.93	15

and will be discussed in that section of this report. Five of the top priorities relate to education and were discussed in the previous section. Several representatives commented that the topics presented did not provide much choice in the business and industrial area. Future needs assessments should include more relevant topics for this target population.

The four remaining priorities are discussed in terms of recommended actions for further planning.

1. Police/community relations. The representatives indicated a need for better cooperation by everyone for better law enforcement and reduction in the crime rate. As no law enforcement representatives where included in this group, it is recommended that these agencies in the region be contacted to obtain their input.

2. Fire fighter training. The business and industrial representatives specifically recommended fire fighter training for employees in manufacturing operations.

3. Local tax assessment. Recommendations concerning a local tax assessment workshop included focusing on the procedures used for assessing taxes and providing explanations for the use of tax money. An investigation should be undertaken to determine whether this topic can be dealt with on a regional basis. Local idiosyncrasies might make this a more appropriate topic for subregional groups to address.

4. Women in management. Preliminary discussion have occurred between the Small Business Administration and AESP personnel. Further planning needs to occur in order to operationalize this concept.

The additional topics listed by business and industry representatives revealed no consistent pattern, therefore, this information is not presented here. The responses will be used as appropriate as a basis for developing further inquiries into business and industry's needs.

The selection of three priority topics by business and industry representatives yielded corroborative evidence for the ten priorities listed in Table 28. The items which were listed by more than one person are displayed in Table 29.

Human Resource Ratings. The ratings of human resource representatives are presented in Table 30. The number of representatives from human resources was small (10), therefore, these results should be interpreted cautiously. Of the top ten priorities, two are dealt with exclusively in other sections of this report, i.e. emergency medical services board training and Appalachian culture. Five of the topics are also dealt with in other sections of this report, but special implications for these as human resource topics are presented. These topics and the remaining three priority topics are discussed below.

1. Family counseling for social workers. A content expert in the area of family counseling for social workers needs to be identified in order for further planning to occur.

2. Training for parents of the severely handicapped. Human resource personnel in the region may be able to provide some of the resources necessary for identification, outreach or follow-up activities (see the education section of this report for further comments).

3. Staff training for senior center workers. Preliminary discussions have been initiated between AESP and the National Institute for Senior Centers and the National Council on Aging. Further planning needs to occur in order to operationalize this concept.

4. Parent education. Human resource personnel may constitute a training audience for parent education if a decision is made to focus on teachers of parents as a target audience (see education section of this report for further comments).

TABLE 29

PRIORITY TOPICS LISTED BY BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL

Topics	Frequency
1. Emergency medical services board training	4
2. Adult basic education	4
3. Fire fighters	4
4. Parents of the severely handicapped	4
5. Reading is Fundamental	3
6. Parent education	2
7. Police/community relations	2
8. Appalachian culture	2
9. Local tax assessment	2
10. Women in management	2
11. Management training	2

TABLE 30

AVERAGE RATINGS BY HUMAN RESOURCE MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL

	Topics	Average Rating	n
1.	Family counseling for social workers	1.80	10
2.	Emergency medical services board training	1.80	10
3.	Training for parents of the severely handicapped	1.89	9
4.	Staff training for senior center workers	2.10	10
5.	Parent education	2.20	10
6.	Ancillary hospital training	2.56	9
7.	Teaching adult basic education	2.56	9
8.	Appalachian culture	2.62	8
9.	Workshop on police/community relations	2.67	9
10.	Workshop on rural American women	2.73	11
11.	Energy conservation for educators	2.78	9
12.	Workshop on Smithsonian Institute's "Reading Is Fundamental" Program	2.78	9
13.	Presentation on the American Nursing Association's training program for nurses in rural areas	2.78	9
14.	Crib death	2.89	9
15.	Workshop on proposal writing	2.78	9
16.	Women in management	3.33	9
17.	Fire fighter training	3.44	9
18.	Workshop on local tax assessment	3.89	9
19.	Workshop on public maintenance	4.11	9

5. Ancillary hospital training. Training for ancillary personnel in hospitals is relevant because social workers and other human resource persons are often employed in such a capacity.

6. Police/community relations. Human resource personnel may provide an avenue for reaching community members.

7. Teaching adult basic education. If training is directed to the teachers of adults, social workers may be a potential target audience.

8. Rural American women. A content expert needs to be identified so that the focus of this topic can be more clearly defined.

The additional topics listed by human resource representatives revealed an interest in child abuse prevention. This is a topic AESP should consider for future programs.

The selection of three priority topics by the human resource representatives yielded corroborative evidence for the ten priorities listed in Table 30. The items which were listed by more than one person are displayed in Table 31.

Government Ratings. The ratings of the government personnel are presented in Table 32. Of the top ten priorities, only two topics directly relate to the functioning of government personnel. The other topics are discussed in the appropriate sections of this report. The two priority topics most germane to government personnel are:

1. Proposal writing. This topic is also of interest to educators. AESP might explore the feasibility of presenting a workshop for both educational and governmental personnel.

2. Fire fighter training. Fire fighting falls within the purview of government activity and did receive a high rating by said representatives. However, no actual fire fighters were represented in the respondent sample. Therefore, AESP needs to contact directly fire fighter representatives in order to more fully ascertain their needs.

TABLE 31

PRIORITY TOPICS LISTED BY HUMAN RESOURCE MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL

Topics	Frequency
1. Family counseling for social workers	4
2. Parents of severely handicapped	3
3. Parent education	2
4. Staff training for senior center workers	2
5. Appalachian culture	2
6. Emergency medical services board training	2

TABLE 32

AVERAGE RATINGS BY GOVERNMENT MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL

	Topics	Average Rating	n
1.	Presentation on the American Nursing Association's training program for nurses in rural areas	2.11	9
2.	Parent education	2.22	9
3.	Emergency medical services board training	2.25	8
4.	Staff training for senior center workers	2.25	8
5.	Training for parents of the severely handicapped	2.40	10
6.	Ancillary hospital training	2.43	7
7.	Workshop on proposal writing	2.50	8
8.	Family counseling for social workers	2.50	8
9.	Workshop on Smithsonian Institute's "Reading Is Fundamental" program	2.56	9
10.	Fire fighter training	2.78	9
11.	Energy conservation for educators	2.78	9
12.	Crib death	2.86	7
13.	Teaching adult basic education	2.87	8
14.	Workshop on rural American women	3.00	9
15.	Workshop on police/community relations	3.00	8
16.	Workshop on local tax assessment	3.00	5
17.	Workshop on public maintenance	3.00	8
18.	Women in management	3.25	8
19.	Appalachian culture	3.50	8

The additional topics listed by government personnel revealed no consistent pattern, therefore, this information is not presented here. The responses will be used as appropriate as a basis for developing further inquiries into government personnel's needs.

The selection of three priority topics by government representatives yielded three topics that were listed more than once. These were: tax assessment (3), police/community relations (2) and parent education (3). The first two topics listed relate most closely to the government area. It is recommended that these topics be explored further due to the small number of respondents and the inconsistent pattern of responses.

Medical and Health Ratings. The ratings of the medical and health representatives are presented in Table 33. The number of representatives for this group is relatively small (15), therefore, these results should be interpreted cautiously. Of the top ten priorities, only one (Reading is Fundamental) bears no direct relation to the medical and health area. These nine priority topics are discussed below:

1. Presentation on the American Nursing Association's training program for rural nurses. AESP will broadcast a workshop from ANA's annual convention in Honolulu, Hawaii on June 12, 1978. Nurses in Appalachia will be able to receive two contact hours of continuing education credit for viewing this program on patient education.
2. Crib death. Potential resources in New York state have been identified for presenting a program on the topic of crib death. Further planning is necessary to operationalize this concept.
3. Ancillary hospital training. AESP delivered two workshops on the topic of human relations and communication skills on May 23 and 25, 1978. Further planning is now necessary in order to further meet the needs of this group.

TABLE 33

AVERAGE RATINGS BY MEDICAL AND HEALTH MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL

	Topics	Average Rating	n
1.	Presentation on the American Nursing Association's training program for rural nurses	1.40	15
2.	Crib death	1.60	15
3.	Ancillary hospital training	1.73	15
4.	Training for parents of the severely handicapped	1.79	14
5.	Emergency medical services training board	1.80	15
6.	Parent education	2.36	14
7.	Family counseling for social workers	2.39	13
8.	Staff training for senior center workers	2.50	14
9.	Workshop on the Smithsonian Institute's "Reading Is Fundamental" program	2.73	11
10.	Women in management	2.77	13
11.	Workshop on proposal writing	2.83	12
12.	Teaching adult basic education	3.27	11
13.	Appalachian culture	3.27	11
14.	Energy conservation for educators	3.33	12
15.	Workshop on police/community relations	3.50	12
16.	Workshop on local tax assessment	3.50	12
17.	Fire fighter training	3.58	12
18.	Workshop on rural American women	3.75	12
19.	Workshop on public maintenance	3.82	11

4. Training for the parents of the severely handicapped. Medical personnel can be a valuable resource for training parents with severely handicapped children.

5. Emergency medical services training board. Preliminary negotiations have been conducted concerning the presentation of a program on this topic. Further planning is still necessary.

6. Parent education. AESP should explore the possibility that part of parent education involves the communication of medical and health information.

7. Family counseling for social workers. As was mentioned in the human resource portion of this report, many times social workers are employed in a hospital setting. Therefore, the desire for this course could impact on the medical and health personnel in the region.

8. Staff training for senior center workers. Because senior center workers need a knowledge of the biological change in older persons, development of a program on this topic would impact on the medical and health persons in the region.

9. Women in management. Several of the comments made by the representatives indicated that this was an important topic for medical and health personnel. Many of the persons employed in this area are females who have had little or no management training. The feeling was expressed that such training geared to females in this field would improve their abilities to progress in their careers and to perform their jobs more effectively.

The additional topics listed by the medical and health personnel included the general recommendation of continuing education for nurses. More specifically, assertiveness training and cardiac physical rehabilitation for nurses were also mentioned.

The selection of three priority topics by the medical and health personnel yielded corroborative evidence for the ten priorities listed in Table 33. The items which were listed more than once are displayed in Table 34. The topic "continuing education for nurses" was once again mentioned as a high priority.

Summary of Ratings. The analysis of data by occupational areas indicated that each target group's priorities were rated differently. Table 35 presents a rank ordering of topics overall and by occupational group. This data indicates that three topics were rated in the top ten by all five occupational groups: training for parents of the severely handicapped, parent education and emergency medical services board training.

Technical Quality of Broadcast

The site coordinators rated the technical quality of the broadcast using a 5 x 5 rating for video reception and a 3 x 3 rating for audio reception. These ratings are presented in Table 36. Of the 14 sites reporting, the majority indicated that the video was received with little or no distortion. The sound was generally received with sufficient strength and clarity. Difficulties did occur at the broadcast facility during the first six minutes of the north broadcast. Mt. Orab, OH indicated that its reception problems did not clear up after the first six minutes.

Summary

A total of 113 persons at 19 sites participated in an AESP Advisory Board teleconference. The format for the teleconference was moderately useful, interesting and effective. More careful planning of future teleconferences can make this a viable way to provide information to and receive input from Advisory Board members.

TABLE 34

PRIORITY TOPICS LISTED BY MEDICAL & HEALTH MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COUNCIL

Topics	Frequency
1. American Nursing Association's program for rural nurses	5
2. Emergency Medical Services Board Training	5
3. Continuing education for nurses	4
4. Ancillary hospital training	3
5. Parent training for the severely handicapped	3
6. Women in management	2
7. Patient education	2

TABLE 35

RANK ORDERING OF TOPICS FOR WORKSHOPS BY ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS OVERALL AND BY OCCUPATIONAL AREA

Topics	Overall	EDUC	B & I	H.R.	GVT	M & H
1. Training for parents of the severely handicapped	1	1	3	3	5	5
2. Parent education	2	2	8	5	2	6
3. Emergency medical services board training	3	7	1	2	3	3
4. Presentation on the American Nursing Association's training program for nurses in rural areas	4	11	11	13	1	1
5. Ancillary hospital training	5	4	13	6	6	4
6. Family counseling for social workers	6	6	15	1	8	7
7. Workshop on Smithsonian Institute's "Reading is Fundamental" program	7	8	2	12	9	19
8. Teaching adult basic education	8	5	3	7	13	12
9. Energy conservation for educators	9	3	5	11	11	11
10. Workshop on proposal writing	10	10	12	15	7	9
11. Staff training for senior center workers	11	16	14	4	4	8
12. Crib death	12	13	17	14	12	2
13. Workshop on police/community relations in Appalachia	13	12	4	9	15	14
14. Women in management	14	14	10	16	18	10
15. Appalachian culture	15	9	16	8	19	13
16. Workshop on local tax assessment	16	15	9	18	16	16
17. Fire fighter training	17	17	6	17	10	17
18. Workshop on rural American women	18	19	19	10	14	18
19. Workshop on public maintenance	19	18	18	19	17	15

TABLE 36

EQUIPMENT FUNCTIONING FOR ADVISORY TELECONFERENCE

Site		Audio rating	Video rating
06	Greenville, SC	3 x 3	4 x 4
09	Tupelo, MS	3 x 3	5 x 5
10	Huntsville, AL	3 x 3	5 x 5
11	Rainsville, AL	2 x 2	3 x 3
12	Guntersville, AL	3 x 3	5 x 5
13	Gadsden, AL	no report received	
18	Cookeville, TN	3 x 3	5 x 5
23	Norton, VA	no report received	
24	Dublin, VA	no report received	
25	Cumberland, MD	no report received	
32	Wheeling, WV	2 x 3	4 x 4
35	Fredonia, NY	3 x 3	5 x 5
36	Olean, NY	no report received	
38	Smethport, PA	no report received	
55	Hazard, KY	3 x 3	5 x 5
51	Somerset, KY	3 x 3	5 x 5
60	Athens, OH	3 x 2	4 x 4
61	Mt. Orab, OH	2 x 2	2 x 2

The Advisory Board members' reactions to potential programs are summarized below according to recommendations for further action:

1. Content experts need to be contacted in order to allow a planning effort to begin for the following topics:
   a) proposal writing (education and government)
   b) family counseling for social workers
   c) rural American women

2. Survey of target audiences need to occur to find out the specific needs in the areas of:

   a) fire fighting
   b) law enforcement
   c) human resource workers

3. Follow through on present planning efforts needs to occur in the following areas:

   a) Reading Is Fundamental
   b) Emergency Medical Services Board Training
   c) crib death
   d) senior center workers
   e) Appalachian culture
   f) women in management

4. Feasibility studies need to be conducted in the following areas:

   a) adult basic education
   b) parents of the severel, handicapped
   c) parent education
   d) tax assessment

5. Additional topics that need consideration include:

   a) child abuse
   b) assertiveness training for nurses
   c) cardiac physical assessment for nurses

6. Topics which have already been implemented by AESP include:

   a) American Nursing Association's program for rural nurses
   b) Ancillary hospital training
   c) Energy conservation for educators.

In conclusion, the AESP Advisory Board members provided much useful information for future program planning. Their input will help AESP better serve the needs of the region.

TEACHER VALUES: "PROBLEMS IN DISCIPLINE" AND "DEALING WITH DEFIANCE"

April 17 and April 24

Lea J. Perritt

Introduction

Discipline is a major concern in today's schools. Problems such as disruptions, defiance, and cheating are areas that teachers deal with daily and indications are that these problems are increasing in frequency.

Investigations have shown that the way a teacher handles his/her classroom can either provoke or prevent discipline problems. In order to deal successfully with discipline problems, a teacher needs to be aware of his/her own values and behavior and how they relate to discipline problems.

The Appalachian Education Satellite Program designed a two-part workshop to help teachers learn how to deal with discipline problems. The workshop explored teacher values and demonstrated how teacher behavior can prevent or provoke problems.

The first session was designed to provide teachers with training in preventing and coping with common discipline problems including truancy, profanity, lying, cheating, and drug and alcohol abuse. The second session dealt with students' challenges to authority and investigated ways in which teachers can prevent and cope with defiance.

Format of the Workshop

The content of the two sessions was based on two videotaped critical incident programs which were developed and produced by the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education at the University of

Kentucky in cooperation with the University of Kentucky Television Center. The programs, entitled "Teacher Values and Discipline" and "Preventive Discipline", each include a series of short "trigger" incidents designed to help stimulate discussion as well as clarify one's values in regard to discipline.

In the first session, eight classroom situations were shown. Following five of the episodes, a short panel discussion of proposed solutions occurred. Following each of the other three episodes, participants engaged in a 10-minute on-site discussion in order to propose solutions to the situation. Participants were then given an opportunity to call their solutions in to the panel members located in the television studios in Lexington, Kentucky.

The format at the second session varied only in the number of classroom situations viewed. Seven episodes were viewed, four of which were followed by a panel discussion and three by on-site discussion.

The panel for the first session was comprised of the following persons:

Dr. Richard Kindsvatter, Department of Secondary Education, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

Ms. Martha Kanapaux, President-Elect of South Carolina Educational Association, Charleston, South Carolina

The panel for the second session consisted of:

Dr. Charles L. Thompson, Psychology and Guidance Department, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee

Dr. Frank Bickel, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky

The panels at both sessions were moderated by Margaret Verble, Ed.D., Research Associate, College of Education, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky.

At the end of each program, participants completed a brief evaluation form to determine their reaction to the program. This information forms

the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Viewers

The analysis of participant reaction was conducted separately for the two sessions. A total of 174 persons at 22 AESP sites participated in the first session and 203 persons at 20 AESP sites atterded the second session. Seventy-seven persons attended both sessions. Evaluation forms were received from 143 participants (82% of those attending) at the first session and 174 participants (86% of those attending) at the second session. The frequency of participants by site for each session is presented in Table 37. Table 38 presents the background characteristics of the participants who completed the evaluation forms.

The two audiences were similar along the dimensions of sex, type of community in which employed, and position held. At both sessions, the majority of the participants were female (75% and 78% respectively) and were employed as teachers (59% and 61% respectively), although a large number at each session were college students. Those who worked in rural communities made up the largest portion of the audience at both sessions (43% and 44% respectively).

The most frequent reason given for attending the workshops at both sessions was personal interest (74% and 59% respectively).

Reaction to the Trigger Episodes

Participants were asked to rate the trigger episodes, described earlier in this report, according to their realism and their value as a source of stimulation for discussion. They also rated the overall value of the trigger episodes. The ratings at the second session were somewhat higher than those at the first session although all ratings were above

TABLE 37

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE
TEACHER VALUES WORKSHOPS

AESP Sites	Session I		Session II	
	Number registered	Number completing forms	Number registered	Number completing forms
01 Lexington, KY	14	8	13	12
06 Greenville, SC	13	13	7	6
07 Spartanburg, SC	1	0	-	-
09 Tupelo, MS	7	7	7	7
10 Huntsville, AL	3	3	5	5
11 Rainsville, AL	2	2	4	4
12 Guntersville, AL	10	10	6	6
18 Cookeville, TN	1	0	55	39
19 McMinnville, TN	-	-	3	3
34 Chattanooga, TN	28	24	34	27
20 Norton, VA	11	11	13	13
21 Stickleyville, VA	2	2	2	2
25 Cumberland, MD	17	0	11	11
26 McHenry, MD	2	2	1	1
31 Bethany, WV	2	2	-	-
32 Wheeling, WV	16	16	21	20
35 Fredonia, NY	2	2	2	2
36 Olean, NY	2	2	-	-
37 Edinboro, PA	-	-	5	5
40 Sylva, NC	9	9	6	6
42 Marion, NC	5	5	5	4
45 Gainesville, GA	7	7	1	1
55 Somerset, KY	18	18	-	-
61 Mt. Orab, OH	2	0	2	0
TOTAL	174	143	203	174

TABLE 38

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PARTICIPANTS
TEACHER VALUES WORKSHOPS

Characteristics	Session I		Session II	
	Frequency	%*	Frequency	%*
Sex:				
Female	107	75%	135	78%
Male	35	25%	37	22%
No response	1		2	
Community they work in :				
Rural	60	43%	74	44%
Urban	47	34%	52	31%
Suburban	31	22%	41	25%
No response	5		7	
Position held in 1977/1978 year:				
Elementary teacher	16	11%	33	19%
Junior high teacher	35	24%	37	22%
Senior high teacher	27	19%	25	15%
Special education teacher	3	2%	5	3%
Adult basic education teacher	2	1%	2	1%
College teacher	1	1%	2	1%
Counselor	9	6%	11	6%
Administrator	8	6%	7	4%
Minister	2	1%	2	1%
Student	28	20%	43	25%
Other	12	8%	4	2%
No response	0		3	
Reason for attending workshop**				
Personal interest	105	74%	101	59%
Requested by supervisor	22	15%	36	21%
Lead in-service training	11	8%	19	11%
Class assignment	12	8%	14	8%
In-service/renewal credit	12	8%	12	7%
Other	1	1%	1	1%
No answer	?		2	

* Percents do not include no responses
** Includes multiple responses

average. A five point scale, with 1 = strongly agree, 2 = moderately agree, 3 = neutral, 4 = moderately disagree, and 5 = strongly disagree, was used to measure participants' ratings of the realism of the trigger films and their effectiveness as a source of stimulation for discussion. Participants at both sessions moderately agreed that the episodes were realistic (average ratings = 1.89 and 1.74 respectively). At the first session, participants moderately agreed that the episodes were effective as a source of stimulation for discussion (average rating = 1.74). At the second session the rating for this item was between "strongly agree" and "moderately agree" (average rating = 1.54).

Overall value was indicated on the following scale: 1 = excellent, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = fair, 5 = poor. The ratings of the overall value of the trigger episodes were between "good" and "very good" for the first session and were "very good" for the second session (average ratings = 2.39 and 2.09 respectively).

The comments were generally favorable as these representative statements suggest:

"Films were very real to life."

"Good examples; thought provoking."

"Presented situations ... about true to life situations."

"I really enjoyed the episodes shown."

"I wish there could have been more examples of classroom situations."

Reaction to the Short Panel Discussions

The participants were asked to react to the effectiveness of the short panel discussions which occurred after each trigger episode as a source of stimulation for discussion. They also rated the overall value of these panel discussions. At both sessions the participants moderately agreed that the discussions were effective as a source of stimulation for discussion

(average ratings = 2.08 and 1.88 respectively). The overall ratings were between "good" and "very good" for both sessions (average ratings = 2.61 and 2.40 respectively). Again the ratings were slightly more positive at the second session than at the first.

Comments made by participants were generally positive, especially at the second session. However, some suggestions for improvement were made.

"I was very impressed with the relevancy."

"The answers were vague, but all in all, the program was interesting."

"Less lengthy, involved discussions."

"The solutions seemed usable and realistic."

"Today's program was much, much better than the first one."

"The panel experts were very realistic - more so than last week."

"Moderator more flexible than last week."

"I was very impressed by the responses of Dr. Thompson."

Reaction to the On-Site Discussions

The participants were asked to react to the effectiveness of the discussions that took place at their sites in helping them to clarify their own values as they relate to discipline problems. They were also asked to provide an overall evaluation of the on-site discussions. Participants at both sessions moderately agreed that the on-site discussions helped them clarify their own values (average ratings = 2.10 and 2.11 respectively). Overall, the on-site discussions were rated between "good" and "very good" for both sessions (average ratings = 2.53 and 2.34 respectively).

Reaction to the Interactive Seminars

The participants were asked to react to the seminar moderator and the answers they received to their questions. They were also asked to

provide an overall evaluation of the interactive portion of the programs. Slightly more than half the respondents at the first session (55%) and the second session (57%) felt the moderator was fine. At both sessions, the most frequent suggestions for improvement were to provide occasional summary statements, ask guests to give more detailed responses, and keep the discussion moving at a faster pace. The participants were less positive about the answers they received to their questions. Only 23 percent of the respondents at the first session and 29 percent at the second session felt the answers were fine. The most frequent suggestions for improvement at both sessions were more frequent use of specific examples and more direct answers to questions. The overall evaluation of the seminar at both sessions was between "good" and "very good" (average ratings = 2.58 and 2.48 respectively).

Attainment of Objectives

These workshops were designed around several specific objectives which the participants were expected to achieve as a result of participating in the programs. These objectives were:

1. Demonstrate an increased awareness of how one's own behavior can create discipline problems;
2. Identify methods for preventing discipline problems;
3. Identify methods for coping with classroom problems;
4. Propose solutions to classroom discipline incidents;
5. Demonstrate an awareness of the importance of clarifying one's own values as they relate to discipline problems.

The first objective, to demonstrate an increased awareness of how one's own behavior can create discipline problems, was measured by asking participants to react to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this workshop, I now have a greater awareness of how my own behavior can create discipline problems." The majority of the

participants at both sessions agreed with this statement (82% and 81% respectively). The average rating was "moderately agree" at both sessions (average ratings = 1.95 and 1.88 respectively).

The second objective, to identify methods for preventing discipline problems, was measured by asking participants to react to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this workshop, I will be better able to identify classroom problems." Seventy-one percent of the participants at the first session and 64 percent at the second session agreed with this statement. The average rating at both sessions was "moderately agree" (average ratings = 2.19 and 2.28 respectively).

The third objective, to identify methods for coping with classroom problems, was measured with four items at each session. At the first session, the participants were asked to react to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this workshop, I will be better able to deal with discipline problems." Seventy-one percent of the participants agreed with this item. The average rating was 2.19 which is "moderately agree." At the second session, the participants reacted to the following statement: "As a result of participating in this workshop, I will be better able to deal with confrontation situations." Sixty-nine percent of the participants agreed with this item. The average rating was 2.16 which is "moderately agree."

The third objective was also measured cognitively by means of two true-false and one multiple choice item at the first session and three true-false items at the second session. At the first session 89 percent of the participants knew that it is important to consider underlying reasons for behavior and 95 percent knew that it is important to be consistent when dealing with discipline incidents. Seventy-six percent of the participants

were able to identify at least one appropriate teacher behavior in dealing with discipline incidents and 44 percent were able to identify both appropriate behaviors listed.

At the second session, 62 percent of the participants knew that the responsibility for appropriate behavior should be placed on the students, 72 percent knew that in many confrontations it is possible to prevent physical violence, and 89 percent knew that open defiance by students can usually be prevented.

The fourth objective, to propose solutions to classroom discipline incidents was measured by asking participants whether they intended to try any of the techniques for coping with discipline problems. Seventy-one percent of the participants at the first session and 69 percent at the second session agreed with this item. The average ratings at each session were "moderately agree" (average ratings = 2.09 and 2.11 respectively).

The last objective, to demonstrate an awareness of the importance of clarifying one's own values as they relate to discipline problems, was measured by asking participants whether, as a result of participating in the sessions, they now had a greater awareness of their own values in relationship to discipline problems. Eighty percent of the participants at the first session and 74 percent at the second session agreed with this statement. The average ratings at both sessions were "moderately agree" (average ratings = 1.96 and 2.03 respectively).

Overall, the objectives were achieved by the majority of the participants at both sessions. One fourth of the participants, however, responded "neutral" to the items asking whether they would be able to identify and deal with classroom problems and try the techniques presented. This may be due to the relatively large percentage of students who were not directly or currently involved in a teaching situation.

Technical Aspects

The participants rated the quality of the video and audio reception during the broadcasts and the site monitors rated the technical functioning of the equipment used during the programs. The participants rated the clarity of the picture as between "good" and "very good" at both sessions (average ratings = 2.35 and 2.16 respectively). The quality of the sound received ratings which were "good" at both sessions (average ratings = 3.25 and 2.78 respectively). Both the video and audio reception were rated somewhat lower by the participants at the first session than at the second.

Table 39 presents the site monitors' ratings of the equipment functioning. Overall, the site monitors rated the video reception at both sessions as having between "imperceptible" and "barely perceptible" distortion and the objectionableness of the distortion between "not annoying" and "slightly annoying." The quality of the sound was rated as readable with practically no or no difficulty and the signal strength as "good" to "very good" at the second session. The audio ratings were somewhat lower at the first session where readability was rated between "with difficulty" and "practically no difficulty" and signal strength was rated between "fair" and "good."

The ATS-6 system operated with 100 percent reliability at both sessions with no malfunctions reported. However, the broadcast at the first session was delayed for 30 minutes due to a break in the command uplink. The commands were uplinked from Quito, Equador and the broadcast was continued. This delay may have contributed to the relatively lower ratings given for the first program.

Needs Assessment Information

In order to determine interest in future programs, participants were asked whether they would be interested in attending additional workshops or courses on related topics, what type of credit they would prefer to receive,

TABLE 39

SITE MONITOR'S RATINGS OF EQUIPMENT FUNCTIONING
TEACHER VALUES WORKSHOPS

Site		Session I		Session II	
		Video	Audio	Video	Audio
01	Lexington, KY	5 x 5	2 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
06	Greenville, SC	4 x 4	3 x 3	4 x 4	3 x 3
07	Spartanburg, SC	4 x 4	2 x 2	no participants	
09	Tupelo, MS	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
10	Huntsville, AL	4 x 3	2 x 2	4 x 4	3 x 2
11	Rainsville, AL	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
12	Guntersville, AL	5 x 5	3 x 3	4 x 4	3 x 3
18	Cookeville, TN	4 x 4	2 x 3	5 x 5	2 x 3
19	McMinnville, TN	report not completed		5 x 5	3 x 3
34	Chattanooga, TN	---	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
20	Norton, VA	5 x 5	3 x 2	4 x 5	3 x 3
21	Stickleyville, VA	4 x 4	2 x 2	5 x 5	3 x 3
25	Cumberland, MD	no report received		4 x 4	3 x 3
26	McHenry, MD	5 x 5	3 x 3	3 x 3	2 x 2
31	Bethany, WV	3 x 3	2 x 2	no participants	
32	Wheeling, WV	report not completed		report not completed	
35	Fredonia, NY	4 x 4	2 x 2	5 x 5	3 x 3
36	Olean, NY	5 x 5	3 x 3	no participants	
37	Edinboro, PA	no participants		report not received	
40	Sylva, NC	4 x 4	2 x 2	5 x 5	3 x 3
42	Marion, NC	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3
45	Gainesville, GA	4 x 4	2 x 2	4 x 4	2 x 2
55	Somerset, KY	5 x 5	3 x 3	no participants	
61	Mt. Orab, OH	5 x 5	3 x 3	5 x 5	3 x 3

See code for audio and video rating on the following page.

Video Signal Rating Scale

Distortion and/or Noise Perceptibility

1. Picture content impossible to ascertain
2. Very perceptible distortion and/or noise but picture content ascertainable
3. Definitely perceptible distortion and/or noise
4. Barely perceptible distortion and/or noise
5. Imperceptible

Distortion and/or Noise Objectionableness

1. Extremely annoying
2. Very annoying
3. Definitely annoying
4. Slightly annoying
5. Not annoying

Audio Signal Rating Scale

Readability

1. Unreadable
2. Readable with difficulty
3. Readable with practically no difficulty or no difficulty

Signal Strength

1. Faint signals or very weak signals
2. Fair signals
3. Good signals or very good signals

and whether they would pay a small fee for participating. Eighty percent of the participants at the first session and 77 percent at the second session indicated they would be interested in attending a workshop on other related topics. Approximately one-half of the participants indicated interest in a course (54% and 56% respectively) with the majority preferring graduate college credit (57% and 62% respectively). The majority also indicated they would be willing to pay a fee to participate (66% and 72% respectively).

Conclusions

One hundred and seventy-four persons participated in session one and 203 persons participated in session two of a two-part workshop in teacher values and discipline. Seventy-seven persons attended both sessions. The participants reacted to videotaped trigger episodes, panel discussions, on-site discussions and interactive segments, several cognitive and attitudinal questions, the technical quality of the broadcast, and interest in future programs on related topics.

The trigger films were rated between "good" and "very good" at the first session and "very good" at the second session. The panel discussions, on-site discussions, and interactive segments received ratings which were between "good" and "very good." Suggestions for improvement included more frequent use of examples, more direct and detailed answers to questions, a faster pace, and occasional summary statements.

The ATS-6 system operated with a 100 percent reliability at both sessions, although the first session was broadcast on a half-hour delayed basis because of a break in the uplink.

Both the cognitive and attitudinal objectives were achieved by the majority of the participants.

Needs assessment indicated interest in additional workshops and graduate level courses in related topics and that participants would be willing to pay a small fee to attend additional programs.

THE NEW COPYRIGHT LAW: ISSUES AND ANSWERS

May 8, 1978

Deborah Danner

On January 1, 1978 the Copyright Revision Act of 1976 (P.L. 94-553) became effective bringing with it significant changes for users of copyrighted materials. When Gerald Ford signed the law in October, 1976, it was the first time in nearly 70 years that the U.S. had a new law governing "intellectual property." The Copyright Revision Act has far reaching implications, particularly for librarians and educators. It dramatically affects classroom practices in the use of copyrighted materials, as well as policies regarding library functioning. The law has generated a great deal of controversy and it has left many issues unresolved. A resolution of some of these issues probably awaits judicial decision.

The Appalachian Education Satellite Program (AESP) designed a workshop to provide information regarding the copyright law to those affected by its changes, to increase awareness of changes in rights and responsibilities, and to provide insight into possible problems in the implementation of the new law. The following report is based on information collected at the May 8, 1978, presentation by the AESP of a workshop entitled "The New Copyright Law: Issues and Answers."

Format of the Workshop

The copyright workshop was a 90-minute program that consisted of three parts. The first part, a presentation of videotaped segments from the American Library Association's (ALA) 1978 teleconference, featured Barbara Ringer, Register of Copyright; Henry Rosenfield, NEA Copyright Consultant; William North, General Counsel, ALA; Ken Winslow, Manager,

Public Television Library, Public Broadcasting Service; and Eugene Alienokoff, Legal Counsel, Agency for Instructional Television.

The second part of the program, a panel discussion which addressed some of the issues raised at ALA's conference, introduced the following panel members:

Susan Bistline, Special Consultant, Office of Copyright

August Steinhilber, Assistant Executive Director and General Consultant, National Association of School Boards

Cathy O'Hara, Head Librarian, Henry Clay High School

The panel was moderated by Timothy Sineath, Dean, College of Library Science, University of Kentucky. During their discussion the panel was concerned with the following topics:

1) purpose and meaning of copyright: fair use

2) off-air taping

3) library copying: penalties and infringements

The third part of the program, the interactive seminar, gave the workshop participants an opportunity to play a more active role in the presentation. During this question and answer segment, questions from the audience were transmitted by the site monitor to the broadcast studio in Lexington, Kentucky.

Participants in the workshop also received a packet of reading materials designed to supplement the information they received in the broadcast and an evaluation form. The information they provided on the evaluation form was used to determine the effectiveness of the workshop and forms the basis for the remainder of this report.

Background Characteristics of Participants

The audience for the workshop consisted of 215 persons who viewed the program from 26 AESP sites. Evaluation forms were received from 161

persons (75% of the audience). Table 40 presents the frequency of participants by site and Table 41 summarized the background characteristics of the viewers.

Both men (36%) and women (62%) from rural (52%), urban (28%) and suburban (18%) areas participated. Most of these people (70%) were employed as teachers or librarians.

Reaction to the Pretaped Program

Participants were asked to rate both the videotaped segments from the ALA conference and the panel discussion as sources of practical information. The rating scale was: 1 = excellent, 2 = very good, 3 = good, 4 = fair, 5 = poor. Their responses indicated an average rating of 2.40 for the ALA presentation, which is between "good" and "very good," and a rating of 2.51 for the panel presentations which is also between "good" and "very good."

Several participants indicated that there was "not enough introduction to the subject since we didn't have the opportunity to read our information packets before the presentations."

Reaction to the Interactive Seminar

Evaluation of the interactive portion of the program was based on questions concerning the effectiveness of the seminar moderator as well as the interactive seminar format. Many workshop participants (58%) thought the seminar moderator was fine, but 17 percent of the participants thought that providing occasional summary statements would have made the moderator more effective. In their reactions to the question and answer format, only 33 percent of those responding indicated they were satisfied with the answers they received, although 65 percent

TABLE 40

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITE
COPYRIGHT WORKSHOP

	AESP Sites	Number registered	Number completing forms
01	Lexington, KY	4	4
07	Spartanburg, SC	3	2
08	Scooba, MS	1	1
09	Tupelo, MS	7*	0
10	Huntsville, AL	4	3
12	Guntersville, AL	6	6
18	Cookeville, TN	19	17
34	Chattanooga, TN	3	3
20	Norton, VA	9	9
21	Stickelyville, VA	10	10
25	Cumberland, MD	19	0
27	Keyser, WV	2	0
28	Petersburg, WV	1	1
29	Altoona, PA	7	7
30	Hagerstown, MD	17	0
31	Bethany, WV	6	6
32	Wheeling, WV	9	9
33	Pittsburgh, PA	15	12
35	Fredonia, NY	19	17
36	Olean, NY	15	12
38	Smethport, PA	8	7
40	Sylva, NC	8	8
42	Marion, NC	10	8
45	Gainesville, GA	10	9
51	Hazard, KY	1	1
55	Somerset, KY	3	3
61	Mt. Orab, OH	6	6
Total		215	161

*Unable to view broadcast due to technical difficulties, therefore this frequency is not included in the total.

TABLE 41

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS IN WORKSHOP
COPYRIGHT WORKSHOP

Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Sex		
Female	99	62
Male	58	36
No response	4	2
Community in which they work*		
Rural	87	52
Urban	47	28
Suburban	30	18
No response	3	2
Present employment		
Elementary teacher	19	12
Junior high teacher	1	1
Senior high teacher	17	10
College instructor	11	7
School librarian	33	20
College librarian	22	14
Public librarian	10	6
Administrator	13	8
Other	33	21
No response	2	1

*Includes multiple responses.

thought the seminar participants were fine. Apparently, the dissatisfaction was not with who was on the panel but with the quality of their answers to questions. The most frequent suggestions for improvement were use of more specific examples and more direct answers to the questions. The overall average rating of the interactive seminar portion of the program was 2.47 which is between "good" and "very good."

Several participants commented on the value of the question and answer part of the program and suggested that extending this session would have made the workshop more effective. Some of their comments follow:

"More time for more questions."

"Question and answer session was the most useful part of the program since it addressed particular problems that arise."

Attainment of Objectives

The objectives for this workshop were that the participants should be able to:

1. Demonstrate an awareness of the purpose and meaning of copyright;
2. Demonstrate an understanding of fair use as it relates to librarians and educators;
3. Identify problems that electronic technology raises for librarians and educators;
4. Identify penalties and infringements related to library copying.

Attainment of the first objective was measured by asking participants whether the workshop had increased their awareness of the copyright law. The rating scale used for this question was: 1 = strongly agree, 2 = moderately agree, 3 = neutral, 4 = moderately disagree, 5 = strongly disagree. An average rating of 2.01 indicated that participants "moderately agreed" with the statement, "As a result of participating in this workshop,

I now have a greater awareness of the purpose and meaning of the new copyright law."

The second objective, to demonstrate an awareness of fair use as it relates to librarians and educators, was measured by two questions (one true-false, one multiple choice). The statement "The new copyright law allows classroom teachers to make unlimited copies for use in their classroom" was recognized as false by 96 percent of the participants, but the question concerning which types of copying are permitted under fair use guidelines presented some problems. Although 73 percent of the workshop participants recognized that a single copy of a chapter or book was allowable, only 34 percent recognized that it was permissable to make multiple copies of short stories. Perhaps the emphasis placed on copyright law penalties and infringements led the participants to be more cautious concerning copying practices.

Objective three, to identify problems that electronic technology raises for librarians and educators, was measured by asking a question about the liability of librarians for illegal use of photocopying machines. Eighty percent of those who responded knew that librarians were not liable for the illegal use of coin-operated copying machines in their libraries.

Objective four, to identify penalties and infringements related to library copying, was measured by two true-false questions. One of these questions was answered with an accuracy level of 94 percent which indicates that participants were aware that penalties for copyright infringement could include both fines and inprisonment. However, the statement that "A teacher or librarian who innocently infringes the law is subject to the same penalties as anyone else" was correctly identified as false by

only 58 percent of the respondents. The ambiguity of the question probably contributed to the poorer performance on this measure.

A majority of the participants achieved the objectives of the workshop with the exceptions noted for objectives two and four. The low accuracy levels on two of the questions measuring these objectives is probably due in part to the difficulty of presenting such a complex topic as copyright law in one 90-minute program.

Technical Functioning

Evaluation of audio and video reception was based on ratings from participants and site monitors. Participants rated the clarity of the picture 2.14, i.e. between "good" and "very good," and the quality of the sound as 2.73, also between "good" and "very good." (1 = excellent, 5 = poor)

The site monitor's ratings of equipment functioning appear in Table 42 Cookeville, TN reported some sound distortion but the problem was resolved. Both Somerset, KY and Chattanooga, TN experienced a 30-second loss of audio signal early in the broadcast. Pittsburgh, PA had annoying audio and video problems for half of the program but still presented the broadcast.

The program was cancelled in Alfred, NY, Tupelo, MS, and Rome GA. Alfred had cable damage and a complete loss of audio and video signal. Tupelo had a malfunctioning receiver, and Rome experienced audio failure.

Overall, the ATS-6 system operated without problems at 22 of the sites. The cancellations at Alfred, Tupelo, and Rome were due to local problems, therefore, only four of the sites' audio or video problems were associated with the functioning of the ATS-6 system.

Needs Assessment

As a way of determining future needs, participants were asked if they

TABLE 42

SITE MONITOR'S RATINGS OF EQUIPMENT FUNCTIONING
COPYRIGHT WORKSHOP

Site		Audio	Video
01	Lexington, KY	3 x 3	5 x 5
07	Spartanburg, SC	2 x 2	4 x 4
08	Scooba, MS	3 x 3	5 x 5
09	Tupelo, MS	1 x 1	1 x 1
10	Huntsville, AL	3 x 3	5 x 5
12	Guntersville, AL	3 x 3	4 x 4
14	Rome, GA	1 x 1	1 x 1
18	Cookeville, TN	2 x 3	5 x 5
34	Chattanooga, TN	3 x 3	5 x 5
20	Norton, VA	3 x 3	4 x 4
21	Stickleyville, VA	2 x 2	3 x 3
25	Cumberland, MD	3 x 3	5 x 5
27	Keyser, WV	3 x 3	5 x 5
28	Petersburg, WV	3 x 3	5 x 5
29	Altoona, PA	3 x 3	5 x 5
30	Hagerstown, MD	report not received	
31	Bethany, WV	report not received	
32	Wheeling, WV	3 x 3	5 x 5
33	Pittsburgh, PA	3 x 2	4 x 4
35	Fredonia, NY	3 x 3	5 x 5
36	Olean, NY	3 x 3	5 x 5
38	Smethport, PA	3 x 3	5 x 5
39	Alfred, NY	1 x 1	
40	Sylva, NC	3 x 3	5 x 5
42	Marion, NC	3 x 3	5 x 5
45	Gainesville, GA	2 x 2	3 x 4
51	Hazard, KY	3 x 3	5 x 5
55	Somerset, KY	3 x 3	5 x 5
61	Mt. Orab, OH	3 x 3	3 x 2

Video Signal Rating Scale

Distortion and/or Noise Perceptibility

1. Picture content impossible to ascertain
2. Very perceptible distortion and/or noise but picture content ascertainable
3. Definitely perceptible distortion and/or noise
4. Barely perceptible distortion and/or noise
5. Imperceptible

Distortion and/or Noise Objectionableness

1. Extremely annoying
2. Very annoying
3. Definitely annoying
4. Slightly annoying
5. Not annoying

Audio Signal Rating Scale

Readability

1. Unreadable
2. Readable with difficulty
3. Readable with practically no difficulty or no difficulty

Signal Strength

1. Faint signals or very weak signals
2. Fair signals
3. Good signals or very good signals

would be interested in attending other workshops. Of those who responded, 79 percent said they would be interested in other workshops. Comments indicated that topics relevant to the library such as censorship and library use would be popular with this audience.

Participants were also asked if they would be interested in a 3-hour graduate or undergraduate course. The response indicated that 45 percent would be interested. Thirty-eight percent would probably not, and 17 percent didn't know whether they would be interested or not. Asking the participants to list courses they would like to see offered generated a diversified list that included education, computer, and library science topics.

Summary

Two hundred and fifteen persons at 26 AESP sites, a majority of whom were librarians and teachers, viewed a copyright program which consisted of a pretaped program, a panel discussion, and an interactive seminar. The participants rated the three parts of the program between "good" and "very good." Suggestions for improvement for the interactive seminar included more frequent use of specific examples and more direct answers to the questions.

A majority of the workshop participants achieved the objectives of the workshop. Low accuracy levels on two of the questions designed to measure achievement of the objectives suggests that there were problems with the workshop participants' understanding of fair use and library copying penalties. The problems with these two topics are probably due to the difficulty of presenting such a complex topic as copyright law in one 90-minute program.

Participants rated audio and video reception between "good" and "very good." The site monitor's evaluations indicated that 22 sites had no difficulty with reception of the broadcast. However, programs were cancelled at three sites due to local problems, and there were audio and video problems at four sites that were related to the functioning of the ATS-6 system.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A total of 1,762 participants at 39 AESP sites attended a series of ten workshops delivered by AESP during the Spring of 1978 (see Table 43). While the format for each workshop varied somewhat, they all included a live, interactive seminar, distribution of related printed materials, and completion of evaluation instruments. The interactive portion of the program was preceded by panel presentations at the resource conservation and University of Cincinnati programs and by videotapes at the arts and aging and advisory board programs. The self-image, teacher values and copyright workshops included both panel presentations and films.

AESP experimented with a variety of other techniques during this series of workshops, including telephone patches and structured on-site activities.

Overall, the majority of the participants were females employed in rural communities, although the majority of those attending the resource conservation workshops were males. The participants were employed in a wide variety of occupations and included teachers, human resource personnel, health and school administrators, nurses, librarians, school planners and maintenance personnel.

The videotapes' ratings ranged from "good" to "very good" at all the workshops. The highest rating was received at the advisory board teleconference and the lowest rating was received by one of the two films used at the second self-concept program. The lack of detail in this film may have contributed to this lower rating.

TABLE 43

FREQUENCY OF PARTICIPANTS BY SITES
SPRING 1978 WORKSHOPS

Workshop	Site Number																
	01	06	07	08	09	10	11	12	13	14	15	18	19	34	20	21	22
Arts and Aging	--	14	--	16	23	2	--	--	12	2	--	5	5	--	--	--	--
Resource Conservation Session I	--	30	--	--	2	5	--	--	--	1	--	29	--	--	--	--	--
Resource Conservation Session II	--	8	--	--	1	6	--	1	--	1	--	7	--	--	--	--	--
Health Planning/ Administration	--	9	--	--	9	--	--	--	--	3	--	3	--	--	2	4	--
Self-Image Session I	--	16	6	--	34	7	--	--	--	--	--	3	1	21	3	--	8
Self-Image Session II	--	10	1	--	--	11	--	7	26	--	9	3	1	26	2	--	7
Advisory Council Teleconference	--	13	--	--	16	3	3	4	1	--	--	12	--	--	5	--	--
Teacher Values Session I	14	13	1	--	7	3	2	10	--	--	--	1	--	28	11	2	--
Teacher Values Session II	13	7	--	--	7	5	4	6	--	--	--	55	3	34	13	2	--
Copyright Workshop	4	--	3	1	7	4	--	6	--	--	--	19	--	3	9	10	--
Total	31	120	11	17	106	46	9	34	39	7	9	137	10	112	45	18	15

TABLE 43 -- CONTINUED

Workshop	Site Number																
	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	35	36	37	38	40	42	43
Arts and Aging	--	27	--	--	--	--	3	4	--	--	12	--	43	32	41	16	7
Resource Conservation Session I	--	64	--	--	--	1	--	2	--	--	13	1	14	4	11	--	--
Resource Conservation Session II	--	10	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	6	--	--	2	1	--	--
Health Planning/ Administration	--	7	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	3	5	--	--	3	6	18
Self-Image Session I	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	7	--	30	26	--	21	7	7	--
Self-Image Session II	--	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	6	--	23	25	--	20	8	--	--
Advisory Council Teleconference	8	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	--	6	2	--	3	8	--	--
Teacher Values Session I	--	17	2	--	--	--	--	2	16	--	2	2	--	--	9	5	--
Teacher Values Session II	--	11	1	--	--	--	--	--	21	--	2	--	5	--	6	5	--
Copyright Workshop	--	19	--	2	1	7	17	6	9	15	19	15	--	8	8	10	--
Total	8	158	8	2	1	8	20	17	66	15	116	76	62	90	102	49	25

TABLE 43 -- CONTINUED

Workshop	Site Number 45	51	55	60	61	Total Participants
Arts and Aging	15	--	6	--	--	285
Resource Conservation Session I	1	--	4	--	--	182
Resource Conservation Session II	--	--	1	--	--	47
Health Planning/ Administration	6	6	5	5	5	101
Self-Image Session I	16	9	--	6	13	243
Self-Image Session II	--	--	--	3	--	192
Advisory Council Teleconference	4	4	7	7	--	113
Teacher Values Session I	7	--	18	--	2	174
Teacher Values Session II	1	--	--	--	2	203
Copyright	10	1	3	--	6	222
Total	60	20	44	21	28	1772

Both, the panel presentations and the seminars received ratings between "good" and "very good". The highest ratings for both the panel presentations and the seminars were received at the first resource conservation program and the lowest at the second resource conservation session. Technical difficulties at this session may have contributed to the lower ratings.

The on-site activities used during the self-image and teacher values programs received ratings between "good" and "very good", although the ratings were somewhat higher at the self-image programs. The use of on-site activities as a part of AESP's workshop format appears to have contributed to the positive reaction to the workshops. This is a factor which will be considered for inclusion in future workshops.

The phone patch, which was used during the self-image programs, was rated between "good" and "very good" at the first session and "very good" at the second session. Audio distortion apparently contributed to the lower rating at the first session. If the technical problems can be solved, the use of the phone patch appears to be an effective means for increasing participants' involvement in the workshops.

The technical quality of the programs generally received ratings which were between "good" and "very good", with two notable exceptions. First, the quality of the sound at the second resource conservation program was rated as "fair". The distortion was attributed to difficulty in repointing the satellite between the north and south deliveries. Second, because of transmitter failure in Lexington, KY, the second session of the self-concept workshop was postponed but was rebroadcast at a later date.

Specific cognitive and attitudinal objectives were defined for each program. At the completion of each program participants responded to items designed to measure their achievement of the objectives. The results indicated that the objectives were generally achieved by participants at all the workshops.

Needs assessment results indicated interest in future progamming on a wide range of topics including crib death, parent effectiveness, family counseling and communication skills, energy conservation and budgeting methods for educational institutions, emergency medical services board training, and program development techniques for the older person. Respondents also indicated interest in college level credit courses, particularly at the graduate level, and a willingness to pay a small fee to attend programs.

The results of this series of workshop deliveries indicate that persons are interested in attending programs on a wide variety of topics and that the reactions to the format changes were positive. AESP plans to continue the development and delivery of workshops and to expand the range of target audiences being served.